

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XVIII.

BALTIMORE, APRIL, 1903.

No. 4.

## ORIGINALS AND ANALOGUES OF THE *Exeter Book Riddles.*

The Riddles of the *Exeter Book* (*E.B.R.*) are, in the main, literary enigmas (*Kunsträtsel*). With a few exceptions, they display the hand of the artist. Not here, as in distinctly popular products, are we met by a scanty framework, a hurried statement of the subject, naïve description, a sudden check in our progress to the goal of the solution, and finally a word of summary. All these divisions may and do appear, but each or every one of them is patiently elaborated with a conscious delight in workmanship and rhythm, with a regard for detail that overlooks no aspect of the theme, however trivial,—in a word, with a poetic subordination of the end in view to the finish of the several parts. In such compositions as the poems of the Storm (II, III, IV), Badger (XVI), Sword (XXI), Book (XXVII), Lance (LXXIII), Water (LXXXIV) and the Horn cycle (XV, LXXXVIII, XCIII) the reader soon becomes aware that the riddle is the least part of itself, that concealment of solution has been forgotten in the joy of creation. Even in the shorter problems, the riddle-maker, draw though he may from the stores of the folk, shapes anew with loving art the story of the ingratitude of the Cuckoo (X), the fate of the Ox (XIII), the labors of the Plough (XXII) and the Rake (XXXV), the journeys of the Ship (XXXIII); or else, by the aid of runes, converts into logogriphs or word-riddles of the study such commonplaces of folk-poetry as the themes of the Cock (XLIV) and Man on Horseback with Hawk (XX, LXV). Yet a small number of the riddles, in tense, terse, pointed style and absence of epic breadth, in freedom from all that is clerkly or bookish, in their almost prosaic adaptation to the primitive understanding, bear so clearly the stamp of popular production that we can hardly deny them a place in the rank of *Volkerätsel* (LIII, LVIII, LXVI, LXX). Notably in those puzzles whose smut and smiles point directly to a humble origin (XXVI, XLV, XLVI, LV,

LXIII) do we miss the presence of the craftsman: at times, indeed, we seem to detect even here, amid the coarseness of the cottage, the leer of a prurient reworker.

Of the authorship of these problems I shall say but a word now. With Bradley's article upon the so-called First Riddle (*Academy*, XXXIII, 1888, 197 f.) died the time-honored belief in Cynewulf's connection with that lyric;<sup>1</sup> but the oft-expressed opinion—resulting inevitably from the first misconception—that Cynewulf was the author of all the riddles in the *Exeter Book* was more tenacious of life, receiving doubtful support from Herzfeld,<sup>2</sup> surviving, though hard wounded, Sievers' essay (*Anglia*, XIII, 1891, 19–21)—which assigned the Riddles on linguistic grounds to the time before Cynewulf—and done to death at last by Madert's monograph.<sup>3</sup> Madert clings, however, to the theory of one author of the Riddles—a view opposed by Herzfeld in a review of the thesis.<sup>4</sup> Whether

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Gollancz, *Academy*, XLIV, 1896, 572; Lawrence, *Publications of Modern Language Association*, N. S. X, 1902, 247–261; Schofield, *Id.*, 262–295.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Rätsel des Exeterbuches und ihr Verfasser. Acta Germanica*, Bd. I, 1890, Heft. I.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Sprache der altenglischen Rätsel des Exeterbuches und die Cynewulffrage*. Marburg, 1900. For the literature of the subject, see Madert, 5 f. and Cook, *The Christ of Cynewulf*, 1900, LII–LIX.

<sup>4</sup> *Herrigs Archiv*, CVI (N. S. VI), 1901, p. 390. Herzfeld has journeyed far from his old position (*supra*) when he says: "Ich gehe sogar noch weiter als Madert und glaube auch nicht dass die Rätsel das Werk eines Dichters sind. Hierbei stimme ich Bülbring zu, der in der Recension meiner Schrift (*Litbl.* 1891, Sp. 156) mit Recht bemerkt: Ohne vollkommenen Gegenbeweis sollte man lieber annehmen dass die Angelsachsen wie mehr als einen lateinischen Rätseldichter, so auch mehrere altenglische gehabt haben. Wie man bei einer Sammlung von Volksliedern schwerlich an einen einzigen Verfasser denken wird, so darf man es meines erachtens ebensowenig bei diesen Rätseln, die mit geringen Ausnahmen doch auch ein Produkt der Volkspoesie sind." Herzfeld may be justified in his conclusions against one-man-authorship: in his premises, however, he has not only confused hopelessly the two classes of riddle-literature, but has failed to understand the true character of the enigmas of *E.B.*

*E.B.R.* emanated from one enigmatograph or from such a school of riddlers as flourished in Germany three centuries since (see Reusner)—I reserve discussion of the question—this much is certain:—that these enigmas not only owe a debt to the Latin *Kunsträtsel*, but that, like many other “literary problems,” they are often deeply rooted in popular tradition. To these various borrowed elements in the Anglo-Saxon collection,—whether derived from scholars or the people,—let us now turn.

I have noted in my introductory article that Prehn<sup>5</sup> has most unfairly exaggerated the indebtedness of *E.B.R.* to the Latin problems so well known in the eighth century.<sup>6</sup> To Symphosius and Aldhelm, it is true, our enigmas owe a small debt, which now for the first time must be properly estimated. At least thirty-nine riddles are totally unconnected with the Latin in theme and treatment.<sup>7</sup> Add to this list eight fragments that furnish no clue to their origin,<sup>8</sup> and the six riddles that treat—if Dietrich’s solutions be accepted—the same subjects as the Latin in quite independent fashion,<sup>9</sup> and the number of queries unrelated to the famous Latin problems amount to more than one half of the whole. Eighteen others of the Anglo-Saxon bear to Symphosius and Aldhelm only a very slight resemblance—perhaps in a single phrase or line—so slight indeed, that the likeness may often be accidental or else produced by identity of topic.<sup>10</sup> But in some sixteen problems

the use and development of one or more motives so closely suggest both the matter and manner of the Latin enigmas that we can hardly entertain a doubt of the service done to *E.B.R.* by the earlier and more bookish puzzles.<sup>11</sup> Yet only seven riddles—seven of ninety-four—are based so directly upon the Latin that we may fairly regard them as translations or reproductions. These are the enigmas of the Mail-shirt (*Leyden Riddle* and *E.B.R.*, xxxvi; A. vi, 3), the two of Creation (*E.B.R.*, xli and lxvii; A., *De Creatura*), Book-moth (*E.B.R.*, xlvi; S. 16), Reed (*E.B.R.*, lxi; S. 2), Flood and Fish (*E.B.R.*, lxxxv; S. 11), and One-eyed Onion-seller (*E.B.R.*, lxxxvi; S. 92). Only in the first three is the English rendering literal, and two of these constitute a poetic homily rather than an enigma. *E.B.R.*, xxxvi, in its two forms, stands out as the solitary instance in our collection of a very close translation of a Latin puzzle.

Quite as unfortunate in results as Prehn’s too fruitful source-hunt has been the attempt among more recent and better scholars to minimize this comparatively slight but certainly very real relation between the Anglo-Saxon and Latin enigmas (see Herzfeld, *supra*). Blackburn’s pretty and ingenious theory (*Journal of Germanic Philology*, III, 1 f.) that our riddle of the Reed (*E.B.R.*, lxi) should not be regarded as an enigma, but should be united with the poem that follows in the ms., fol. 123 a., “The Husband’s Message,” into a lyric, “A Love-letter,”<sup>12</sup> can rest only upon a studious ignoring of the correspondence between all the motives in the little Anglo-Saxon poem and those in the *Arundo* problem of Symphosius (2)—a correspondence indicated through parallel columns by Dietrich (*Haupts. Zs.*, xi, 452). Then, too, this theory calmly overlooks the striking circumstance—riddles are, indeed, dangerous ground for those who

<sup>5</sup> *Komposition und Quellen der Rätsel des Exeterbuches*. Paderborn, 1883.

<sup>6</sup> Zupitza, *Deutsche Littatg.*, 1884, p. 872, long since took issue with Prehn’s conclusions of wholesale borrowing from learned sources, and affirmed his belief in the popular origin of many *E.B.* puzzles.

<sup>7</sup> *E.B.R.*, viii, xiv, xv, xvi, xviii, xix, xx, xxii, xxiii, xxv, xxvi, xxx, xxxii, xl, xlii, xliii, xliv, xlv, xlvi, xlvii, li, lii, liii, lv, lvi, lxii, lxiii, lxv, lxviii, lxix, lxx, lxxiv, lxxvii, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxviii, xc (Latin) xciii, xciv.

<sup>8</sup> *E.B.R.*, lxxv, lxxvi, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxxii, lxxxix, xcii, xciv.

<sup>9</sup> *E.B.R.*, v (S. 100), vii (A. viii, 3), xxiv (S. 64), xxxiii (S. 13), xxxiv (S. 10), lxxi (A. iv, 8).

<sup>10</sup> *E.B.R.*, ii, iii and iv (A. i, 2); vi (A. iii, 13), ix (A. ii, 5), xi (A. iv, 11), xii (A. xii), xxi (A. iv, 10), xxviii (A. ii, 3; vi, 9), xxix (A. vii, 2), xxxv (S. 60), liv (A. v, 8), lvii (A. iv, 3), lviii (A. vi, 1), lxxii (S. 76), lxxiii (A. v, 8; vi, 8), lxxxiii (S. 89), xci (S. 4).

<sup>11</sup> *E.B.R.*, x (S. 100), xiii (S. 56; A. iii, 11; v, 8), xvii (S. 61), xxvii (A. v, 3, 9), xxxi (S. 9; A. i, 3), xxxvii (A. vi, 10), xxxviii and lxxxvii (S. 72), xxxix (A. iii, 11), xlix and lx (A. vi, 4), l (A. ii, 14), lix (S. 70, 71), lxiv (A. vi, 9), lxvi (S. 44), lxxxiv (A. iii, 1; iv, 14). There is, of course, a possibility even here that the Latin and Anglo-Saxon enigmas draw their parallel passages from a common source—perhaps popular tradition.

<sup>12</sup> Morley, with the same disregard of origins, long since suggested (*English Writers*, II, 38) as an answer to *E.B.R.*, lxi: “A letter-beam cut from the stump of an old jetty.”

have never investigated their history—that this Latin *Arundo* enigma has been expanded into *Kunsträtsel* in several languages. One of Reusner's troop of sixteenth-century pedants, Antonius Thylenius Consentinus (R. I, 311), develops this pleasing puzzle into a long-winded problem, "Fluminis undisonas ripas praetexit arundo," etc. It appears a hundred years later in an elaborately descriptive sixteen-line French version (Menestrier, *La Philosophie des Images Enigmatiques*, Lyon, 1694, p. 241):—

"Je suis de divers lieux, je nais dans les forêts,  
Tantôt près des ruisseaux, tantôt près des marais," etc., etc.

An incorrect Latin text of the riddle is crudely rendered into fifteenth-century German in the *Volksbuch* version of the Apollonius of Tyre story.<sup>13</sup> With all these the Anglo-Saxon furnishes an instructive comparison. I shall have occasion to return to Blackburn's theory.

Though the claims of Symphosius and Aldhelm, as creditors of *E.B.R.*, must be duly acknowledged, a protest should be registered against those of Aldhelm's contemporaries and countrymen, Tatwine and Eusebius.<sup>14</sup> The evidence that these enigmatographs influenced the Anglo-Saxon riddles in either matter or form is too slight to convince anyone but him handicapped by a set thesis based on antecedent probability. In some ten cases I notice a resemblance between *E.B.R.* and the Latin enigmas;<sup>15</sup> but this likeness is very slight, being limited in every case to a single phrase or line, and seems to be entailed rather by the nature of the subject than by actual transmission. It is moreover noteworthy that in all these instances, except the Horn Cycle and the Body and Soul enigma (XLIV), both *E.B.R.* and the Latin writers are working under the influence of the motives of Symphosius and Aldhelm (*supra*).<sup>16</sup> But in one

riddle, at least,—that of the Young Bull—the resemblance to the Latin of Eusebius is indeed very close and striking. *E.B.R.*, XXXIX closes:—

"Mon mapelade, se þe me gesaegde,  
seo wiht gif hio gedygeð, duna briceð;  
gif he tobirsteð, bindeð cwide."

Eusebius (37) following Aldhelm (III, 11) writes:—

"Si vixero, rumpere colles  
Incipiam, vivos moriens aut alligo multos."

So Ebert, 50, and Prehn, 213, insist with every show of reason that the speaker ("mon mapelade") is Eusebius. Unfortunately for this conclusion, other Latin riddles of the Old English period furnish quite as close a parallel to *E.B.R.*, XXXIX. Bede, "Flores," No. 12 (M. P. L. 94, 539 f; Kemble, *S. and S.*, 326) gives the following:—"Vidi filium inter quattuor fontes nutritum: si vivus fuit, dirupit montes: si mortuus fuit, alligavit vivos." And I find the same motive later in Brit. Mus. ms. Burney 59 (eleventh cent.), fol. 11 b.:—

"Dum juvenis fui, quattuor fontes siccavi;  
Cum autem senui, montes et valles versavi;  
Post mortem meam, vivos homines ligavi."

In the light of the wide vogue of the riddle,<sup>17</sup> the chief claim of Eusebius as a source fails.

To another writer, far more famous than these enigmatographs, *E.B.R.* may perhaps confess a small obligation. Pliny's *Natural History* was a cherished book in the English libraries of this period, as Alcuin's oft-quoted verse-catalogue shows. The Anglo-Saxon Bird riddles (*E.B.R.*, IX, X, XXV) furnish interesting parallels to Book X of the Roman's work, but, as in the Swan riddle (VIII), it is entirely possible that the folk-lore of

Ähnlichkeiten der englischen Rätsel mit zwei oder drei lateinischen Dichtern nachweist, wären wir geneigt nicht an unmittelbare Entlehnung zu denken sondern zu glauben dass sowol die Gegenstände, wie auch die Art der Betrachtung Gemeingut des Volkes geworden war und somit der Dichter nur bekanntes aufgenommen hatte, aber es doch eigenartig wiedergab." The history of *E.B.R.*, XXXIX, Young Bull, and of several other Anglo-Saxon riddles confirms this view.

<sup>17</sup> The Ox riddle, with motives very similar to the Anglo-Saxon version, appears in many modern collections:—Simrock,<sup>3</sup> p. 33; Eckart (Low German), Nos. 585, 586; Renk (Tyrol), *Zs. d. V. f. Vlk.*, v, 115, No. 68; Wossidlo (Mecklenburg), No. 78; Schleicher (Lithuania), 205, 207.

<sup>13</sup> Schröter, *Mitth. der deutschen Gesellsch. zur Erforschung vaterl. Sprache, u. s. w.*, Bd. v, 1872, Heft II, p. 66: compare also Weismann, *Alexander*, Frankfurt, 1850, I, 80.

<sup>14</sup> Ebert, *Berichte über die Verh. der k. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Leipzig. Phil.-Hist. Cl.*, XXIX, 1877, 20-56.

<sup>15</sup> *E.B.R.*, xv, LXXXVIII and XCIII, Horn Cycle (E. 30); "Water" riddles, II, XXXI and LXXXIV (E. 21, 15, 23); XXI (T. 30, E. 36); XXIV (T. 32), XXVII (T. 5, 6; E. 31, 35); XLIV (E. 25).

<sup>16</sup> Holthaus (*Anglia*, VII, Anz., 125) makes an eminently sane remark:—"Besonders in den Fällen wo Prehn



the time is really the creditor of our enigmas.<sup>18</sup> In one instance, however, there is some slight evidence of a direct literary connection. *E.B.R.*, II, follows, not verbally, but motive for motive, Pliny's account of "Water" (*Nat. Hist.*, Bk. XXXI, c. 1):—"Terras devorant aquae; flammas necant; scandunt in sublime et caelum quoque sibi vindicant: ac nubium obtentu vitalem spiritum strangulant, qua causa fulmina elidunt, ipso secum discordante mundo. Quid esse mirabilius potest aquis in caelo stantibus? At illae ceu parum sit in tantum pervenire altitudinem rapiunt eo secum piscium examina: saepe etiam lapides subvehunt, portantes aliena pondera." The "calculus of probabilities" invites a doubt whether this resemblance be a mere matter of coincidence. It is, moreover, singularly significant that this very passage from Pliny is cited as an enigma by one of Reusner's authors ("Natale de Comitibus Veneto," R. I, 77): that the Anglo-Saxon poet should have recognized, many centuries before, its value as riddle-stuff, is in no way unlikely.<sup>19</sup>

If *E.B.R.* must admit a debt to natural history, popular and scientific, to the folk-lore and mythology of their credulous century they owe surely as much. Riddle LXXIV has troubled students sorely. Though Dietrich admits in honest scholarly fashion (*H. Z.*, XII, 248) that his solution, Cuttlefish, was wide of the mark, the changes have been rung upon this answer somewhat helplessly by Prehn and Walz (*Harvard Studies*, v, 266). Trautmann (*Anglia, Beibl.* v, 48) futilely suggests, "Water." I find a clue in two Latin riddles in Reusner's collection; the first is by Scaliger (R. I, 177):—

"Me fugere pice et velo victricia signa,  
Qua sum, qua non sum foemina, piscis, avis."

<sup>18</sup> Compare *E.B.R.*, IX, with Alcuin's pretty lyric in praise of the Nightingale (*M. P. L.*, 101, 803.)

<sup>19</sup> *E.B.R.*, XXXI, Rainwater, also points to the *Natural History* chapter. That it is one of the Water cycle, no one can for a moment doubt who compares it carefully with Vienna MS. 67, No. 50 (*Mone, Anz.* VIII, 219), Brussels MS. 604 (12th cent.), No. 48 (*Id.*, 40), *Strassburg Rb.*, Nos. 52, 54, 57, and Scaliger's *Pluvia* (Reusner, I, 184). Blackburn's solution, *Bēam* (Wood), (*Journal. Germ. Phil.*, III, 1 f.)—indeed his entire theory—is based upon the sandy foundation of insufficient knowledge of riddle-literature.

The second is by Reusner himself (R. II, 77):—

"Foemina, piscis, avis sum, nautas fallere docta,  
Sum scopulus, non sum foemina, piscis, avis."

The answer to each of these is "Siren." Now the word appears several times in the Anglo-Saxon glosses (Bosworth-Toller, s. v. "Meremen"), and the creatures themselves were well-known in British waters.<sup>20</sup> No mention is made in the Latin riddles of the double sex referred to in *E.B.R.*, LXXIV; but it is noteworthy that in Middle High German "Siren" appears sometimes as a male water-spprite.<sup>21</sup> Had it not been for the evidence of the Reusner enigmas—with their interesting ascription of Protean traits to Sirens—I should probably have offered as a solution, "Dolphin" or "Sea-pig" ("Mereswin"—common enough in A-S. vocabularies, B-T.), as this fish was supposed to possess the power of assuming other forms (Gervase, c. LXIII, p. 30). As it is, the "Dolphin" solution fits so well the second half of *E.B.R.*, XXXVII, "Pregnant Sow," "She fared the flood-ways," etc., that one is inclined to believe that the poet has emphasized thus the double meaning and gender of the word, "Porcus" ("Sow" and "Dolphin").<sup>22</sup>

There is yet another riddle, which opens the gates to a world of strange beliefs and superstitious fancies. To *E.B.R.*, XI, Stopford Brooke (*Early Eng. Lit.*, p. 179, Note) offers the fitting answer, "Barnacle Goose;" and this solution is sustained by the first enigma in the collection of Pincier (*Aenigmatum Libri Tres*, Hagae, 1655), which

<sup>20</sup> Gervase of Tilbury, in his *Otia Imperialia* (1211)—edited by Liebrecht, Hannover, 1856—c. LXIV, p. 31, describes the "Sirenes maris Britannici," their woman-fish shape and their song. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, x, 70, classes the Sirens among fabulous birds. So Reusner's "foemina, piscis, avis" gains in some fashion support.

<sup>21</sup> "Da kam ein syren  
Gefloggen der den selben sarc uf brach"  
(*Orendel*, 94).

<sup>22</sup> Says Gervase, LXIII, p. 30:—"Quisquis marini fluctus investigator extitit aut ipsius maris explorator audiat et constanter affirmet, nullam in nostra habitatione terrena repertam cujusvis animantis effigiem, cujus similitudinem non liceat in piscibus Oceani Britannici ab umbilico superius speculari . . . Illic porcus quem delphinum nominant, quem de genere militum esse vulgus autumat, porcina inter fluctus maris transsumpta latentem effigie."



has many points in common with the Anglo-Saxon:—

"Sum volueris, nam plumosum mihi corpus et alae  
Quarum remigio, quum libet, alta peto.

Sed mare me gignit biforis sub tegmine conchae  
Aut in ventre trabis quam tulit unda.

Solutio—

Anseres Scotici quos incolae *Clak gyyse* indignant . . .  
in lignis longiore mora in mare putrefactis gignuntur."

The first literary account of this fable,—which caps the query at every line—is found in the *Topographia Hiberniae* of Giraldus Cambrensis in the last half of the twelfth century.<sup>23</sup> Giraldus, after a long description which tallies remarkably with the Anglo-Saxon, declares that 'bishops and clergymen in some parts of Ireland do not scruple to dine off these birds at the time of fasting, because they are not flesh nor born of flesh.' With such evidence as this, we must accept Max Müller's opinion (*l. c.*) that 'belief in the miraculous transformation of the Barnacle Shell into the Barnacle Goose was as firmly established in the twelfth as in the seventeenth century.' If we refuse to believe that this superstition existed four centuries before Giraldus, there is another solution of *E.B.R.*, xi, which also has an analogue to recommend it. Dietrich, with Aldhelm's "Famfaluca" (iv, 11) in mind, suggested, "Ocean-furrow." Now, while the Anglo-Saxon has little in common with Aldhelm, it bears, at least in part, a certain resemblance to

<sup>23</sup> Two strangely created goose-species are described by medieval writers:—1) The Tree Goose; 2) The Barnacle Goose or Clack. The first of these is discussed at length by Gervase of Tilbury, *l. c.*, c. cxxiii, p. 52, by William of Malmesbury in a story of King Edgar (*Gesta Regum Anglorum*, II § 154, *Rolls Ser.*, 1887, I, 175), by Mandeville (c. xxvi) and by other writers until the time of Hector Boethius (*Description of Scotland*, 1527, c. xi, englished in Holinshed's *Chronicle*, vol. I), who declares this tree-procreation false, but affirms his belief in Barnacles or Bernakes. The second is treated by Giraldus Cambrensis, *Topographia Hiberniae*, Dist. I., c. xv (Dymock, *Rolls Series*, 1867, v, 47-49); by his contemporary, Alexander Neckam, *De Naturis Rerum*, c. XLVIII (*Rolls Ser.*, 1863, p. 99), by Hector Boethius, *l. c.*, by Turner, *Avium Praecip. Hist.*, 1544, s. v. "Anser," by Gerard, *Herball*, 1597, p. 1391 (Brooke), and by many other authors quoted by Pincier and Liebrecht. Excellent reviews of the history of the superstition will be found in Müller's *Science of Lang.*, 2<sup>d</sup> Ser., 1865, 552-571, and Harting's *Ornithology of Shakspeare*, 1871, 246-256.

the Wave riddle of the *Hervarar Saga* (*Heidreks Gatur*, 21—see Heusler, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.* xi, 127), and to its derived form in modern Icelandic (Arnason, *Izlenzkar Gatur*, 1887, No. 684). But Brooke's solution seems in every way better, as this alone fits all the motives of the poem.

Let us consider now the use in *E.B.R.* of popular material. To Riddle xiv, Dietrich (*H. Z.*, xi, 464) answers, "The 22 Letters of the Alphabet," and points to Aldhelm, iv, 1. But there are at least three strong objections to this solution:—a.) Of the unknown creatures appear only "ten in all—six brothers and their sisters with them;" and Dietrich does not cope successfully with the numerical difficulty. b.) "Their skins hung on the wall." That the "skin" is the parchment Dietrich tries to convince us by citing an Alphabet riddle of a Heidelberg ms. of the 15th century (Mone, *Q. F.*, 120),—"Es hat ein teil in leder genist,"—and by changing for his purpose "teil" to "fell." But this sort of circular reasoning is seldom effective. c.) "Bereft of their robe . . . they tear with their mouths the grey leaves," could hardly be said of letters.<sup>24</sup> In a word the solution is far-fetched. This Trautmann felt, when he offered (*l. c.*) another answer; but "Ten Young Chickens" is, like so many of his solutions, an absurdly random guess. The key to the problem is presented by Bede's "Flores," No. 2 (*M. P. L.* 94, 539 f.), "Vidi filium cum matre manducantem cujus pellis pendebat in pariete;" where the "son" is evidently the pen, the "mother," the hand, and the "skin," the glove. So, in our riddle, the ten creatures are the fingers—the six brothers being the larger, the four sisters, the little fingers and thumbs. Since both the Latin and Anglo-Saxon queries suggest stuff drawn from the people, it is not surprising that *Volksrätzel* are full of parallels. In popular riddles the fingers are always browsing animals.<sup>25</sup> And the

<sup>24</sup> Indeed in many German *Volksrätzel*, we are distinctly told (Wossidlo, 469), "Sie (d. h. Buchstaben) essen nichts, sie trinken nichts." Compare Eckart, *Nd. Rätzel*, Nos. 387, 999; Renk (Tyrol) *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, v, 157, No. 164.

<sup>25</sup> Note Frischbier (Prussia), *Zs. f. d. Ph.*, xxiii, 248, No. 73, "Fif Zege fräte von einem Hupe" (Fingers of spinning hand); Simrock, p. 67, "Daer gungen tein Tatern | Um einen Busck matern;" *Id.*, p. 103, "Zehn Schäflein fressen an einen Heuhaufen."

glove ever hangs on the wall.<sup>26</sup> The new solution is thus clearly established.

Among the problems of *E.B.* are a few that from their wide vogue in all centuries well deserve the title of world-riddles. Prominent in this short list is the query of the Month (*E.B.R.*, xxiii). This is, of course, a variant of the Year problem, which, in one form or other, appears in every land as Ohlert, 122-126, Wünsche (*Kochs Zs.*, N. F. ix, 1896, 425-456) and Wossidlo, pp. 277-278 have shown. The Anglo-Saxon chariot-motive has long since been linked by Dietrich with Reinmar von Zweter's "ein sneller wol gevierter wagen" (Roethe, *R. von Z.*, 1887, Rid. 186, 187, p. 616). But there are many other analogues. Haug<sup>27</sup> translates from the *Rig-veda*, I, several Time riddles, in one of which (Hymnus, 164) the year is pictured as a chariot bearing seven men (the Indian seasons (?)) and drawn by seven horses; in another (H. 11) as a twelve-spoked wheel, upon which stand 720 sons of one birth (the days and nights). Still closer to the Anglo-Saxon is the Persian riddle of the Month,<sup>28</sup> also cited by Wünsche, in which thirty knights (the days of the month) ride before the Emperor. In the "Disputatio Pippini cum Albino," 68-70 (*H. Z.*, xiv, 530 f.) the Year is the Chariot of the World, drawn by four horses, Night and Day, Cold and Heat, and driven by the Sun and Moon. And finally in the *Lügenmärchen* of Vienna ms. 2705, fol. 145—classified by its editor, Wackernagel (*H. Z.*, II, 562) as a riddle—the narrator tells how he saw, through the clouds, a wagon, upon which seven women sat and near which seven trumpet-blowers (*garzüne*) ran and a thousand mounted Knights rode.

"Der lügenaere nam des goume,  
Das si nach dem selben sliten,  
Alles uf dem wolken riten,  
Und wolten da mite über mer."

<sup>26</sup> Renk, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, v, 158, No. 170:—

"Was hängt an der Wand  
Wie Totenhand?"  
(Handschuh.)

Simrock,<sup>3</sup> p. 70.

"Es hängt wott an der Wand  
Un lett offe'ne Daudemanns Hand."

<sup>27</sup> *Sitzb. der könig. Akad. der Wiss. zu München, Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, II, 1875, 457 f.

<sup>28</sup> J. Gorres, *Das Heldenbuch von Iran aus dem Schah Nameh des Firdussi*, Berlin, 1820, I, 104 f.

The likeness of these last lines to the desire of the sixty knights in *E.B.R.*, xxiii, to pass over the sea is peculiarly suggestive. "Reinmar's riddle," says Roethe, p. 251, "is really popular—that is, it is not drawn directly or indirectly from learned or Latin sources." This is equally true of the Anglo-Saxon problem; still we must feel that, like Reinmar's poem, it has come to us from an artist's hand.

Inferior in interest and popularity to the riddle of the Month, yet among the oldest and best known of relationship problems, is the query of Lot's Daughters (*E.B.R.*, XLVII—compare *Gen.* xix, 32-38). Friedreich, p. 98, cites from Lightfoot's selection<sup>29</sup> from the Talmud (Midras Mishlae) the narrative of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon and the riddles proposed by the royal guest.<sup>30</sup>

The second of these is our enigma. Though this had no vogue in the Middle Ages—yielding in favor to such riddles of strange family-ties as those of the Reichenau ms. 205 (M. and S., *Denkmäler*, 1892, p. 20) and *Strassburg Rb.*, 305, or of incest as that proposed by the King in the Apollonius story (Riese, *Ed.*, 1893, c. iv; *Gesta Romanorum*, c. 153; Shakspeare's *Pericles*, I, 1)—it appears twice in Reusner's volume (I, 335, 353), in the second case as a mock-epitaph, and is noted by Wossidlo (No. 983, *Notes*) in several modern German forms. The query does double duty in the *Izlenzkar Gatur*, 594, 688. And in England we meet it, not only in the collections of Chambers (*Ed.*, 1871, p. 113) and Gregor (*Publ. Folk-Lore Soc.*, 1881, p. 76), but two centuries earlier in the *Holme Riddles*, No. 10 (Harl. 1960, fol. 2 a.) *E.B.R.*, xxxiv, (Ice), contains, at least in its closing lines, a motive known to all ages of riddle-makers (See my introductory article), while *E.B.R.*, xxxvii (Pregnant Sow) has been traced through many analogues by Heusler, *l. c.*, p. 141.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> "Horae Hebraicae in Evang. Lucae, xi, 31," *Opera Omnia*, Rotterdam, 1686, II, 527. Cf. *Folk-Lore*, I, 354.

<sup>30</sup> Hertz, "Die Rätsel von Königin von Saba," *H. Z.*, xxvii, 1883, 1-33, treats at some length the various versions of the Queen of Sheba story and the several riddles put into her mouth of wisdom by the authors of different lands. In the English form of the legend (Weber, *Metrica Romances*, 1810, I, 263) no riddles are mentioned.

<sup>31</sup> Dietrich (*H. Z.*, xi, 470-472), with his usual acumen, discovers in *E.B.R.*, xxxvii, the use of "secret script," but he says nothing of the history of this kind of writing, nor does he seem to have known that it was often em-

We may now pass to those riddles, which, in their form and substance, are so evidently popular products as to suggest that the poet has yielded in large measure to the collector—the puzzles of double meaning and coarse suggestion. To these we should naturally expect to find many parallels in folk-literature, and we are not disappointed. To *E.B.R.*, XLV, Dietrich offers two answers, "Key" and "Dagger Sheath." Either or both may be correct (compare my first article), as each has strong support. The first is favored by Roland's fifteenth-century French riddle (No. 144), by Eckart's Low German queries (Nos. 222, 223), by Wossidlo, Nos. 145<sup>a</sup>, 434 n<sup>2</sup>, and by the very lively problems in the *Izlenzkar Gatur* (Nos. 603, 607, *Skra og Lykill*), all which bear many resemblances to the Anglo-Saxon: the second is sustained by Wossidlo, 434 i<sup>2</sup>, and by the very similar English puzzle in *Holme Riddles*, No. 130 (Harl. 1960, fol. 13 b.) and *Royal Riddle Book*, 1820, p. 11. To *E.B.R.*, XLVI, Herzfeld and Trautmann have independently given the obvious solution, "Dough." Confirmatory evidence is overwhelming. The riddle appears in various forms in modern Germany (Eckart, Nos. 88, 440, 506; Wossidlo, Nos. 71, 126), does service in the fifteenth century (Köhler, *Weimar Jhrb.* v, 329 f. No. 30), is cited twice in Schleicher's Lithuanian collection, p. 195, and is known to English peasants (*R.R.B.*, p. 4). Dietrich's "Bakeoven" and Trautmann's "Buttercask" fit equally well *E.B.R.*,

ployed in medieval enigmas. Suetonius records (*De Vita Caesarum*, I, 56) that Julius Caesar employed in his familiar epistles a cipher formed by a consistent exchange of the letters of the alphabet; and that Augustus, too, used "notae" or secret writing (II, 88):—"Quotiens autem per notas scribit B pro A, C pro B ac deinceps eadem ratione sequentes litteras ponit." Isidor, Bishop of Seville (d. 636), in his widely-read *Origines* (I, c. 25), ascribes the use of this device ("notae litterarum") to Brutus and the two great Caesars and quotes a letter from Augustus to Tiberius. Mention in so famous a text-book doubtless gave to the script a vogue. Alcuin turns to account the method in giving the solutions of his "Propositiones" (*M. P. L.*, 101, 1145), sometimes assigned to Bede (*M. P. L.*, 90, 665)—e. g., No. XXVI, "CBNIS BC FUGB LFPRKS"—and a similar substitution of consonants for preceding vowels appears in the answers to the riddles of the early tenth-century Reichenau ms. 205 (*supra*). This enigmatic style of writing survived long, as its use in solutions by the anonymous author of *Aenigmata et Graphei Veterum et Recentium* (Duaci, 1604) testifies.

LV; but the weight of modern riddle-testimony is on the side of the second solution (Eckart, Nos. 59, 86, 427, 905, Wossidlo, Nos. 138, 144, many references, 434 u<sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, in *E.B.R.*, LXIV, we cannot but prefer Dietrich's "Beaker" to Trautmann's "Flute," if we compare with the Anglo-Saxon the spirited Holme Riddle, No. 128 (Harl. 1960, fol. 13 b.), "A young man in a tavern drinking a gill of sack." And finally *E.B.R.*, XXVI—with the exception of its first lines that make Dietrich's second solution, "Hemp," preferable to all other answers—is reproduced almost verbatim in the "Onion" stanza of *R.R.B.*, p. 11. Such analogues establish beyond question the genuinely popular character of this coarse riddle-stuff.

Not only, however, in those riddles that bear in form and style the distinct impress of the folk do we find popular elements. Many enigmas of *E.B.*—"literary" though their manner proclaims them—are indebted to that stock of commonplace domestic traditions, that simple lore of little things, which we recognize as the joint property of kindred races. Though the Anglo-Saxon puzzles are often entirely individual and isolated in their treatment of familiar themes, yet the likeness of their motives to those of other Germanic queries is surely as remarkable as their differences. To many riddles we seek in vain for parallels; to others analogues throng apace. Let us compare these problems of early England with those of Scandinavia. Heusler, *l. c.*, has already invited attention to the correspondences between the themes and motives of *E.B.* and of the *Hervarar Saga*. The list is not long. *Heidreks Gatur*, 21 (Waves) has a slight affinity to *E.B.R.*, XI (*supra*); the Old-Norse Anchor (*H.G.*, 6) is, like the Old-English one (*E.B.R.*, XVII), a fighting warrior; the Pregnant Sow riddle is common to both people (*H.G.*, 12, *E.B.R.*, XXXVII), and *E.B.R.*, LVIII is treated in the same manner as *H.G.*, 10 (Hailstones), though the matter is somewhat different and the likeness of topic more than doubtful.<sup>32</sup> With the modern

<sup>32</sup> The following riddles of the two groups treat the same topics but in a totally different fashion:—*H.G.*, 1, *E.B.R.*, XXVIII (Beer or Mead); *H.G.*, 8, *E.B.R.*, LXVI (Leek or Onion); *H.G.*, 9, *E.B.R.*, XXXVIII, LXXXVII, (Bellows); *H.G.*, 15, *E.B.R.*, VII (Sun); *H.G.*, 24, *E.B.R.*, XXXIV (Iceberg); *H.G.*, 26, *E.B.R.*, VI (Shield); *H.G.*, 29, *E.B.R.*, LI (Fire); *H.G.*, 30, *E.B.R.*, LVII (Loom); *H.G.*, 34, *E.B.R.*, LXXX (Falcon).



folk-riddles of the *Izlenzkar Gatur*, our problems yield an interesting comparison—and this no one has yet made. *E.B.R.*, LVII, Web and Loom, may be annotated throughout by the twenty-six Icelandic riddles of various phases of the Weaver's craft.<sup>33</sup> The Anglo-Saxon Ship (*E.B.R.*, XXXIII) vies as a benevolent monster with the creature that plays the chief part in more than forty Norse problems;<sup>34</sup> while the glorious Book, bringer of many blessings (*E.B.R.*, XXVII, 18 f.), and the Bible, "thing of the Lord God" (*E.B.R.*, LXVIII) received equal praise in the Icelandic collection.<sup>35</sup> The Bellows of *E.B.R.*, XXXVIII, LXXXVII(?) is the theme of five Norse riddles,<sup>36</sup> and the Anglo-Saxon problem of the Rake (XXXV) has much in common with the *Gatur* of like subject.<sup>37</sup> On the whole the likeness between the queries of the two groups is too general to betray any very intimate connection; but the appearance of such similar elements in *I.G.* furnishes no slight proof of the popular character of *E.B.* riddle-germs.

With the *Kunsträtsel* of various centuries our collection naturally invites comparison; and the points of meeting, though few, are highly suggestive, for they show beyond question that the artist or school of artists of the *Exeter Book* did not disdain those motives, which enigmatographs of every age readily borrow from the people. We have already seen that, in the Bull and Ice and Fingers riddles, popular motives are employed that appealed with equal force to the author of the

so-called "Flores of Bede." At least two other problems in that small but valuable collection develop but slightly themes worthy of fuller and finer treatment; and the Anglo-Saxon, possessed of the same motives, displays a master's use of suggestive material. "Flores," 7, tells us boldly enough that Day flees before Night, that the resting place of Day is the Sun and of Night a cloud. Upon a similar idea of hostility between the forces of Day and Night—truly, a common enough tradition, yet rare in riddle-literature—the poet of *E.B.R.*, xxx, builds an exquisite myth, worthy of the Vedas, indeed not unlike the Sanskrit problems of the powers of nature (see Haug, *l. c.*).<sup>38</sup> "Flores," 1, is a literary riddle of *Sapientia*, "illa mulier quae innumeris filiis ubera porrigit." To *E.B.R.*, XLII, I propose the same solution. Wisdom is "the mother of many races, the most excellent, the blackest,"<sup>39</sup> the dearest, which children of men possess."

In Reusner's volume a few enigmas, when compared with *E.B.R.*, display an identity of mental processes peculiarly interesting in view of the great difference between the times and men that produced them. The Bow and *Ballista* are the subjects of one riddle by Scaliger (*R.* i, 172); while the very language unites closely *E.B.R.*, XXIV and XVIII.<sup>40</sup> Another riddle by Scaliger (*R.* i, 190), *Cannabis*, gives in every line a reason

<sup>33</sup> Dietrich's solution of *E.B.R.*, xxx, Moon and Sun, seems to me strongly supported by the close likeness between the last lines of that riddle, "Nor did any one of men know afterwards the wandering of that wight," and Vienna MS. 67, No. 60 (*Luna*), 1-2 (Mone, *Anz.*, VIII, 219):—

"Quo movear gressu nullus cognoscere tentat,  
Cernere nec vultus per diem signa valebit."

<sup>39</sup> "Blackest," of course, refers to the script of books, the precious products of Wisdom—"black seed" it is called in one of the best known of world-riddles (Wossidlo, No. 70). If my answer be correct, this riddle belongs, in subject at least, to the class of the *Aenigmata* of Boniface (Brit. Mus. MS. Reg. 15 B. XIX, fol. 204—See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.*, i, 332).

<sup>40</sup> "Altera mi similis," says Scaliger's "Bow" of his comrade in arms; the similarity of the two weapons is evidenced in the Anglo-Saxon descriptions. Dietrich's first solution of XVIII, *Ballista*, is therefore better than his second, *Burg*; while Trautmann's *Backofen* is a characteristically wild shot.

<sup>33</sup> *I.G.*, 6, 49, 60, 79, 81, 82, 339, 447, 499, 536, 576, 644, 657, 737, 798, 853, 912, 976, 982, 983, 1082, 1088, 1110, 1133, 1140, 1147. These are full of accurate detail, human interest and lively personification. Side by side with these and the Anglo-Saxon, we may put the Lithuanian Loom riddle (Schleicher, p. 198), in which "a small oak with a hundred boughs calls to women and to maidens."

<sup>34</sup> In *E.B.R.*, XXXIII, the Ship moves on one foot: in *I.G.*, 151, it crawls on its belly footless; while in *I.G.*, 514, the eight-oared craft has eight feet. The Anglo-Saxon vessel is like the *Kaupskip* of *I.G.*, 615, 651, bearing food to men. Compare, also, *I.G.*, 131, 293, 429, 516, 585, 725, 1162-1194 (seventeenth century).

<sup>35</sup> The Book is a joyful health-giver (*I.G.*, 241, 329) and has an immortal soul (*I.G.*, 711). Compare *I.G.*, 390, 558, 584, 599, 619, 904; and the nobly-conceived Bible riddles (*I.G.*, 775, 805, 999).

<sup>36</sup> *I.G.*, 195, 726, 860, 925, 1152.

<sup>37</sup> *I.G.*, 578, 629, 1053. Compare riddles of Shovel (*I.G.*, 154, 358, 608, 1102, 1135).

for accepting "Hemp" as an answer to the misleading *E.B.R.*, xxvi, that interesting adaptation of the Onion motive to another theme. The sketch of the overthrow of potent potters in the long riddle of Lorchius (*R.* i, 282, *Dolium Vini*) has much in common with *E.B.R.*, xxviii, Mead.<sup>41</sup> And one can have, I think, little doubt of the correctness of Morley's Apocalyptic solution ("Lamb of God," *E. W.*, II, 224-225) of the obscure Latin riddle, *E.B.R.*, xc, after a comparison with the enigma of Aurelius Prudentius (*R.* i, 295):—

"Christus Agnus,  
Agnus vice mirifica  
.....  
Agnus hiare lupum prohibes."

and with the last line of the German problem, Pfälzer MS. 693, fol. 27 (Mone, *Anz.*, VII, 381, No. 312):—

"Do quam ein lam und benam dem wolfe dy herte  
.....  
(Solutio) Der arge wolf, daz ist Luciper;  
.....  
Das lam, das waz der werde got."

I select but two more parallels between our group of riddles and literary enigmas. The fifteenth century German query (Mone, *Anz.*, II, 235), so lengthy and confused in its symbolism, suggests not so much through its contents as through the marginal note, "Es ist leib, geist und sel," *E.B.R.*, XLIV, Body and Soul. Finally the second line of the *Ostrea* griphos of Ausonius ("Epistle to Theon," VII, *Works*, Amsterdam, 1750, p. 161), "Dulcibus in stagnis refluī maris aestus opimat," resembles the opening of the Anglo-Saxon Oyster riddle (*E.B.R.*, LXXVII), "The sea fed me."<sup>42</sup>

Among the modern folk-riddles of England and the Continent the number of parallels to *E.B.R.* is not after all large. Unlike the influence of Symphosius throughout Europe or the direct literary working of the *Heidreks Gatur* in Iceland and the Farøe Islands, the motives that appear in the Anglo-Saxon collection, if we may draw a conclusion from the scanty evidence at our

command,<sup>43</sup> seem to have affected little the current of native riddle-tradition. Yet there is a preceptible swirl in the stream. A few English riddles of the present resemble, in theme and treatment, *E.B.R.*; and, more noteworthy yet, two or three of these are unique among recent puzzles in this resemblance. In the latter case we may safely regard the modern riddle-stuff not as a new creation but as a survival of the old. To the Onion riddle and to others of like coarseness I have already pointed. As the Old-Norse problem of the Pregnant Sow (*H.G.*, 12) is revived in two riddles of *I.G.*, 447, 448, so the similar Anglo-Saxon query (*E.B.R.*, XXXVII) reappears in the *Royal Riddle Book*, p. 9, Sow with Nine Pigs. The interesting riddle of the Wine-cask (*E.B.R.*, XXIX) has something in common with *Amusing Riddle Book* (Montrose, 1830), p. 28, A Barrel of Beer; the Oyster puzzle (*E.B.R.*, LXXVII) is reproduced in *Wit Newly Revived* (Newcastle, 1780), p. 21; and the leitmotif of the splendid enigma of the Stag-horn (*E.B.R.*, LXXXVIII) is recalled by the little Ox-horn riddle in *W.N.R.*, p. 11:—

"Divided from my brother now,  
I am companion for mankind," etc.

The modern "monster" riddle of "Man on Horseback with Hawk on Fist" (*Book of Merry Riddles*, Ed. 1660, No. 70; *Holme Riddles*, No. 28) employs an ancient and widely spread motive,<sup>44</sup> which is so totally neglected in the pointless *E.B.* logogriphs, xx, LXV, that it is difficult to regard these runic riddles as other than fragments. Several other English problems treat the same themes as *E.B.R.*; but I can detect no resemblance save that of topic between the modern riddles of Fire (*B.M.R.*, No. 74), Bellows (*R.R.B.*, p. 6), Plough (*Id.*, p. 18), Mermaid (*Id.*, p. 19) and Sheath (*Id.*,

<sup>41</sup> In unfavorable contrast to the activity of German scholars, Frischbier, Renk, Wossidlo and Petsch, and many others, in their home-field, the popular riddle has been almost neglected by students of English folk-lore. Many problems of great traditional value doubtless lie buried in the manuscripts of British libraries (compare *Holme Riddles*, MS. Harl. 1960, and the puzzles of MSS. Sloane, 848 and 1489) or else, current in the mouths of peasants, await their historian.

<sup>42</sup> *H.G.*, 35, Odin on Slepnir; Rolland, p. 15, No. 35, Man on Horseback; Simrock,<sup>3</sup> p. 55, Rider; Frischbier (Prussia), *Zs. f. d. Ph.*, XXIII, p. 256, No. 162, many references.

<sup>43</sup> See also Hadrian Junius x, *Vinum* (*R.* i, 241), and Vienna MS. 67, No. 51, *De Vino* (Mone, *Anz.*, VIII, 219).

<sup>44</sup> See Pliny's *Natural History*, IX, 74, 79, XXXII, 21.

p. 19) and the Anglo-Saxon enigmas (*E.B.R.*, LI, XXXVIII, XXII, LXXIV, LVI).

A few continental parallels to the queries in our collection, and then I have done. The fearfully made creatures in the Anglo-Saxon poems of musical instruments (*E.B.R.*, XXXII, LXX) are not unlike the prodigies in the Lithuanian and Mecklenburg *Geige* riddles (Schleicher, p. 200; Wossidlo, No. 230<sup>a</sup>); but in coincidence of fancy lies doubtless the sole explanation of this resemblance. The Low German "Aderjan" and "Snaderjan" (Eckart, No. 428; also 123, 124) bear a sufficient likeness to the Two Buckets of *E.B.R.*, LIII, to satisfy me that Dietrich has here found the fitting solution;<sup>45</sup> the Onion of *E.B.R.*, LXVI, is "a biter when bitten" as in the German riddle (Wossidlo, No. 190; Petsch, pp. 95-96); and the Communion-cup of *E.B.R.*, LX, is closely akin to the subject of the Tyrolese problem (Renk, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, v, 149, No. 17). And finally, the motives of the highly imaginative query of the Ox (*E.B.R.*, LXXII) appear again far afield in the riddles of Lithuania and Bukowina (Schleicher, 207, 211; Kaendl, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, VIII, 319).

While so short a study as this can, of course, make no claim to exhaustiveness, enough has been said, I hope, to establish the *Exeter Book* problems in their proper place in riddle-literature. I have sought not only to indicate more accurately than has before been done their relation to literary enigmas, but also to trace, what has hitherto passed almost unnoticed, their indebtedness to popular motives.<sup>46</sup>

FREDERICK TUPPER, JR.

*University of Vermont.*

<sup>45</sup> Trautmann's solutions, "Broom" and later "Flail" seem far-fetched and beside the mark, while Walz's answer, "Yoke of Oxen led into the barn or house by a female slave" smacks of that fatal obviousness so dear to victims of the riddler's art.

<sup>46</sup> Since the appearance of my first article in the January number of the *Notes*, I have read, in the Harvard Library, Pitre's important Introduction to his *Indovinelli, Dubbi, Scoglilingua del Popolo Siciliano* (*Bibl. delle Trad. Pop. Sic.*, xx), Torino-Palermo, 1897. His entertaining and scholarly treatment of several points that I have independently considered—e. g., "the literary sources and popular origins of riddles"—has simply strengthened my views upon these topics. In at least one matter of detail, however, I must admit fault. The German Illo

#### NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF FREE OPEN o IN ANGLO-NORMAN.

The present article is a chapter detached from an *essai de grammaire* of Anglo-Norman which I shall soon publish; the consideration of this dialect will represent, in its turn, but the first part of a projected *Manual of Old French Dialects*, which, as the first part will show, is now approaching completion. My hope is that material thus brought together for the first time in convenient reference form may constitute a background for the re-investigation of many points of detail of Old French grammar that are still obscure. With texts, dates and facts of each dialect as an entity before us, we can follow the definite history of a given phenomenon in a given dialect and decide what bearing it may have on general Old French. In a manual of the kind intended, it is impossible to treat at length of all these separate points; but, in order to illustrate the use to which I trust my compilation may be put, I have inserted a partial development of some ideas that suggest themselves in an examination of the history of open o in Anglo-Norman. I now offer the same here in advance, thinking that a new presentation of the light that Anglo-Norman developments throw on the general subject of open o may be of interest to the student of Old French who, perhaps, will not look for a consideration of the general subject in a special treatise on dialects.

The "definite history" of many of the phenomena arising in a study of open o is yet to be written. One cannot read what has been proposed and, after an examination of the evidence for himself, be satisfied that the last word has been said. I offer some fragmentary suggestions on various points, hoping thereby to invite attention to and discussion of them. A final solution demands a new, detailed study of open o in each old dialect; such a study will surely bear fruit.—In accordance with my general plan, I treat first the (supposably) phonetic developments of the given sound, afterwards the orthographic symbols used by the scribes

riddle must not be regarded as "distinctively Teutonic" (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XVIII, p. 7): Pitre has proved (pp. LXXX-LXXXVII) that, in the form of a *Rätselmärchen*, it obtains in many countries of Southern Europe.



to indicate such developments. To the first class, then, belong *o*, *ue*, *eu*, *u* and *e*; to the second, *oe*, *oi*, *eo*, *ø*, *ö*. For the sake of completeness, and on account of their interdependence, I shall mention each one of these even when I have nothing new to add.

1. *o*. The keeping of *o* in its undiphthongized (by the side of the diphthongized) form is one of our Anglo-Norman peculiarities. We find the *o*, of course, in our older texts, though not with consistent frequency: *pople*, *pot*, *quor*, *ovre*, *volt*, etc. Philippe de Thaün probably did not know the diphthongization of the *o*; <sup>1</sup> in the *Lois Guillaume*, *o* is used to the entire exclusion of *ue* or *oe*; <sup>2</sup> in the Oxford (or rather Montebourg) and Cambridge Psalters *o* is found, though not in the majority of cases; <sup>3</sup> in the *Quatre Livres des Rois*, again, *o* prevails in the proportion of four to one <sup>4</sup> (that is, as compared with *ue*, *oe*, etc.). Leaving this older group of texts, we note the firm hold of the *o* in Anglo-Norman in that it recurs in the monuments of a much later date, certainly up to the middle of the thirteenth century, as, for example, in Angier,<sup>5</sup> Chardri,<sup>6</sup> Guillaume de Berneville,<sup>7</sup> *Amadas*<sup>8</sup> and *Boeve*.<sup>9</sup>—In connection with this *o* is to be recorded the *oi* found in Anglo-Norman as a representative of open *o* before a palatal by the side of the regular *ui*, (*hoi*, *poisse*, etc.); this *oi* is doubtless a reminiscence of the original *o* before the palatal previous to diphthongization (> *uoi*, *uei*, *ui*) though it is by no

means so frequent as the *o* (for *ue*) to which we have just referred.<sup>10</sup>

2. *ue*. This is not the place to enter upon, or even to refer to, the extensive bibliography on the interesting general questions raised with regard to the history of the diphthong *ue*: whether the *u* of *ue* was pronounced as *ou* or *ü*; if the diphthong was rising or falling; when the pronunciation *ö* (Mod. Fr. *eu*) came in, and the like. The last point (*eu*) is particularly difficult to decide for Anglo-Norman, both on account of the marked confusion of orthographies, and because the *eu* to which we are accustomed in French texts of the continent is extremely rare in our dialect (cf. below, § 3). We have reason to suppose that, for a time at least, *ue* may have had a double value in Anglo-Norman; that is, *u-e*, and *ö*.<sup>11</sup> The earliest text for which the pronunciation *ö* is claimed for *ue* is, I think, Chardri.<sup>12</sup> (The sound *ö*, however, may have existed earlier (cf. below, § 6, d).

As to whether *ue* (and *ie*) were rising or falling diphthongs, it is difficult to discover essential facts on which to base conclusions. We find as variants of *ie* (<open *ε*) *i* and *e*, and of *ue*, *u* and *e*; of these variants we may say, I think, that Anglo-Norman favored *e* for *ie* and *u* for *ue*; this fact seems to point to an original *iê* and *ûe*. The Oxford Psalter, where we have marks of accentuation, renders *ie* by *iê*, *ue* by both *ûe* and *uê*. The stress must have varied at different periods of the language, or with different scribes or in some other (unknown) way; such was obviously the case in our dialect where we meet *ie*, *i*, *e*; *ue*, *u*, *e*. Theorists on the original nature of these diphthongs will, I fear, be driven to seek their data outside of Anglo-Norman lines.<sup>13</sup>

An important point to be observed with regard to *ue* in our dialect is that it may rhyme with close *e*, and thus give rise to a set of rhymes whose exact parallel does not exist on the continent; such a rhyme is that of *quer* with infinitives of the first conjugation, as *honurer* or *counter*. These

<sup>1</sup> Mall, *Li Cumpoz Philippe de Thaün*, Strassburg, 1873, p. 48; Walberg, *Le Bestiaire de P. de T.*, Paris, 1900, p. lxxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Matzke, *Lois de Guillaume le Conquérant*, Paris, 1899, p. xlvii.

<sup>3</sup> Harseim, *Vokalismus und Consonantismus. Oxf. Psalt.*, Roman. Stud., iv, 292; Schumann, *V. und C. Camb. Psalt.*, Heilbronn, 1883, p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Plähn, *Les Q. L. R.*, Göttingen, 1888, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Meyer, *Romania*, xii, 196; Cloran, *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great*, Strassburg, 1901, p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> Koch, *Chardri's Josaphaz, Set Dormanz und Petit Plet* (Altfr. Bibl. i), Heilbronn, 1879, p. xxviii; cf. *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, iii, 593.

<sup>7</sup> Paris et Bos, *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, par G. de B. (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1881, p. xxxi.

<sup>8</sup> Andresen, *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, xiii, 85.

<sup>9</sup> Stimming, *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Hautmonte*, (Bibl. Norman. vii) Halle, 1899, p. 207.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Altfr. Grammatik*, p. 59.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Koschwitz, *Uebertieferung und Sprache der Chans. du Voyage de Charlemagne*. Heilbronn, 1876, pp. 29 and 73.

<sup>12</sup> Koch, *o. c.*, p. xxviii.

<sup>13</sup> For some general remarks here, cf. Suchier, *Zt. Rom. Phil.* i, 291, *Grammatik*, pp. 40 and 48; Nyrop, *Läbbl. Germ. Rom. Phil.* i. 223.

rhymes have been cited for *Auban*, *Donnei des Amants*, *Bozon*, and other texts.<sup>14</sup>

3. *eu*. Few examples of *eu* for close *o* exist in Anglo-Norman, and fewer of *eu* for open *o*. Stimming<sup>15</sup> gives *seut*, *veut* (in which, however, the *u* may be equivalent to an *l* which has vocalized), *queur*, *peuple*, *veulle*, *peut*, *demeure* [*demeure* should not be included here since the open *o* of the Latin early became close in this word<sup>16</sup>]. Apparently we shall have to study each example and each text separately in order to determine approximately the phonetic significance of the *eu*. In the *Vie de Saint Thomas*, for example, Meyer assigns different values to the *eu* according as it represents French *ue* (*veut*) or open *o* (*eurent* for *orent*).<sup>17</sup> What shall we say when we encounter a rhyme like one in the *Apocalypse*, *touz: leus* (LÖCUM)?

4. *u*. This letter used for open *o* has always been recognized as a marked Anglo-Norman characteristic; it is found in *Philippe de Thaün*, *Oxford Psalter*, *Quatre Livres des Rois* and *Brandan*, among our earlier texts: *buf*, *put*, *vult*, *uvrent*, etc.<sup>18</sup> Our dialect is, apparently, the only one in which we find an open *o* represented by *u*. If, however, we look upon this *u* as a reduction of the diphthong *ue* and not as a direct variant of undeveloped open *o*, it will not seem so abnormal. In the earlier stages of studies in our dialect the *u* was treated as such a variant of the *o*,<sup>19</sup> and this view of the *u* appears natural enough, since the keeping of the *o* itself (cf. above, § 1) was a distinct peculiarity, and considering *u* as a variant of so common an element was, to all intents, not

stretching a point. To my mind, however, this opinion was entirely erroneous. First of all, the use of *u* for open *o* would necessarily imply a certain assimilation of open *o* and close *o* (for the latter, *u* is the constant Norman and Anglo-Norman equivalent); we may note, too, that *o* for original close *o* is kept, with some degree of frequency in our earlier texts, being preferred to *u* in *Philippe*<sup>20</sup> and *Brandan*,<sup>21</sup> and used often in *Angier*,<sup>22</sup> *Chardri*<sup>23</sup> and *Adam*;<sup>23</sup> we would expect to find the explanation of such supposed assimilation in the fact that the *o* for open *o* was used so often and so early as to lose, in part, its separate identity, and become of the same value as close *o* (that is, *u*). The facts, however, do not warrant our assuming the assimilation. Open *o* was evidently a very independent element in Anglo-Norman; while open and close *e* rhyme together in checked position from the time of our earliest texts, such is not the case for open and close *o* (except, of course, before nasals, both free and checked which do not enter into the discussion of the present point). To suppose assimilation at all, we would have to place it at an early date, since *u* for open (or close) *o* is early; if it had been early the probabilities are that it would have been thorough and extensive, because simplifications, of whatever kind, were favored in Anglo-Norman; but our scribes obviously did not confuse the two sounds. They had little difficulty in denoting the value or values of close *o*; from the earliest texts we find *o*, then *u*; *ou* was not popular in the dialect in its early period; examples of *ou* may be counted by ones and twos up to *Angier*; *eu* was an exotic, late and isolated. When we note the expedients for indicating the developments of open *o*, on the other hand, we find that the orthographic variants for them (cf. below, § 6) as compared with those for close *o* are in the proportion of three to one; our scribes had difficulties with the open *o* from the very outset; if the developments of this latter had, in any sense, approached those of close *o*, whose value was so definite, the average Anglo-Norman scribe would have been glad to combine the two; it was a coincidence that *u* should appear

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia Gallica* (Altfr. Bibl. VIII) Heilbronn, 1884, p. 46; Paris, *Romania* XXV, 532; Smith et Meyer, *Les Contes Moralists de Nicole Bozon* (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1889, p. lix, 3.

<sup>15</sup> Boeve, p. 208.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Zt. Rom. Phil.* II, 509, and Paris, *Vie de St. Gilles*, p. xxxi, footnote 1. Stimming mentioned *demeur* as showing close *o* on p. 190 (Boeve). On p. 208 he is quoting from Stürzinger, who gives open *o*.

<sup>17</sup> Meyer, *Fragments d'une Vie de Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry* (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1885, p. xxix.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gröber, *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, II, 509; Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Lang. Rom.*, I, 202, § 217; Suchier, *Français et Provençal*, p. 23, *Grammatik*, p. 41; Stimming, *Boeve*, p. 208.

<sup>19</sup> Cf., for example, Mall, *Cumpoz*, p. 50; Fichte, *Die Flexion im Cambriger Psalter*, Halle, 1879, p. 63; *Zt. Rom. Phil.* II, 481.

<sup>20</sup> Mall, *Cumpoz*, p. 41.

<sup>21</sup> Hammer, *Zt. Rom. Phil.* IX, 87.

<sup>22</sup> Meyer, *Romania*, XII, 197.

<sup>23</sup> Stimming, *Boeve*, p. 190.

for open *o* (that is, for *ue* < open *o*) and for close *o* too. We must remember *e* for *ue* too (cf. below, § 5); to claim that *u* is not from *ue* destroys the possibility of a reasonable explanation for *e*. This latter shows that at one time, or with some scribes, the emphasis was on the *e* (of *ue*); the *u*, that with others the accent bore on the *u*; the two, *u* and *e* are surely to be explained side by side. With *ue* so early and constant a product in general French and in Anglo-Norman too, we must be suspicious of explanations of any phase of the history of open *o* that do not take into account, when possible, this *ue*. When we confront *vult* with *vuelt* it is certainly more reasonable to look at *vult* as a derivation from *vuelt* (the original general French form) than to think that, although we can detect no apparent reason for it, the open *o* went two different ways in the two words, becoming *u* in *vult*, diphthongizing in *vuelt*. We may derive some additional light on our point from a comparison of *ue* and *ie* (< open *E*). The phenomena associated with these two must have been alike in many particulars. For *ie* we have in Anglo-Norman *i* and *e* (*cil*, *cel* = *ciel*) just as for *ue* we find *u* and *e*. I know of no suggestion that *i* for *ie* is a direct variant of open *E*, without passing through the stage *ie*; yet *i* is used for close *e*, too, even rhyming with it,<sup>24</sup> and close and open *e* are early assimilated in checked position. The analogy of *i* from *ie*, then, seems to point to *u* from *ue*.

5. *e*. The use of *e* for *ue* is likewise considered as characteristic of our dialect. We note little discussion as to any time difference between the *e* and the *u* for *ue*. Meyer-Lübke treats of *e* first, saying that it occurs early, then he continues: 'One is surprised to find *u* also for *ue*,' as if *e* were the more characteristic or usual.<sup>25</sup> Stimming<sup>26</sup> says that *ue* becomes *e* especially after 1200. If what I have said above (§ 4) as to the derivation of *u* from *ue* be correct, it follows that I must consider the original accentuation of the combination to have been *ue*, and, therefore, any time difference must be in favor of *u* as older than *e*. This "difference" in Anglo-Norman, however, is merely relative, and we need not suppose that *u* was used regularly for a period of years and that

afterwards *e* came in; the difference was doubtless slight, and the employ of the one or the other depended upon the circumstances which influenced each individual scribe. The texts cited by Stürzinger and Stimming for *e* are comparatively late: Adgar, Angier, Auban, etc. (*em*, *fleves*, *sell*, *vett*, etc.)

#### 6. Orthographic Variants.

a. *oe*. This is found with great frequency in Norman and Anglo-Norman texts, especially at the beginning of words, and is, supposably, a device of the scribes to distinguish *ue* (= *ue* < open *o*) from *ue* (= *ve*) by writing the former as *oe*.<sup>27</sup> (See, however, the last few lines of my remarks under c, below).

b. *oi*. We have here an orthographical sign of quite frequent occurrence. Stimming<sup>28</sup> cites examples from *Brandan*, *Tristan*, *Chardri*, *Boeve*, and a few others; as, *estoit*, (*estuet*), *voit*, (*vuelt*), *poit*, (*puet*), etc. Stimming suggests that we meet here an instance of "umgekehrte schreibung;" he starts from the reduced forms, *estet*, *pet*, *vet*, etc.; these the scribe ignorantly thinks to restore (?) to *estoit*, *poit*, *voit* because he confuses *estet*, *pet*, *vet* with derivatives of original close *e* (< Latin *E* or *Y*) for which *oi* was the proper French equivalent, and by no means absent from Anglo-Norman.—The explanation does not appeal to me, though I do not insist on my own way of looking at the variant in question. Analogies for confusions and pseudo-restorations are not far to seek in the dialect, it is true; we witness such entanglements among the various *e*'s; there is the *e* < *A*, the *e* reduced from *ie* (< open *E*) and the *e* reduced from *ei* (< close *E*); confronted with these (and still other) *e*'s, the scribes became apparently bewildered, and, in their desire to reconstitute correct forms they replaced *e* < *A* by *ie* (*piert* = *PARET*), *e* < *ei* by *ie* (*fiez* = *feiz*, *fois*), and, on the other hand they wrote *ei* for *e* < *A* (*espeie* = *espee*) and for *e* < *ie* (*teirz* = *tierz*), etc.; in other words, general confusion. I hint at this well-known condition of affairs in order to bring out the point that our scribes were entirely consistent in their mistakes; every confusion worked two, or more, ways. Con-

<sup>24</sup> Stimming, *Boeve*, pp. lv, lvi and 188.

<sup>25</sup> *Gram. Lang. Rom.*, I, 202, § 217.

<sup>26</sup> *Boeve*, p. 208.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Lang. Rom.* I, 196, 198, § 211.

<sup>28</sup> *Boeve*, p. 208. Stimming omits *bois* (*BÖVES*) from *Cumpoz* (L) cited by Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 41.



sequently it seems to me that if the scribes had really confused the *e* (of *ue*) with the *e* (of *ei*), we would rightly expect to find them using some other variant of the *e* (of *ei*), and notably *ei* itself rather than *oi*, which is not a regular Anglo-Norman product, as is *ei*. No *ei* (*ai*) is recorded, so far as I am aware, as a variant of the *e* for *ue*, although *ei* occurs for every other *e* in Anglo-Norman, even for checked *e* (open and close).

To my mind, then, the confusion referred to by Stimming is not the one which influenced our scribes; for that matter, I question using *e* as a background for explanations in general, since it was comparatively late and rare. What more evident starting-points do we need than *estot*, *vot*, *pot*, present in the language from the very beginning (cf. above, § 1)? These the scribe changed to *estoit*, *voit*, *poit*, just as he often (ignorantly) corrected (?) every simple vowel (except *i* of course) in his language by adding *i* to it, on account of the frequency with which his eye encountered *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, *ui* which had developed regularly before palatals. The analogy for his *oi* is even closer than in this general tradition, for *oi* < open *o* before a palatal exists in our older texts as a remnant of the old *oi* before development (> *uoi*, *uei*, *ui*), just as simple *o* represents the stage before the diphthongization of open *o*.

c. *eo*. The use of *eo* for checked *e* in Anglo-Norman is often referred to, though the examples are not frequent: *Camb. Psalter* and *Brandan iceols*, *Camb. Psalt. feorm* (FIRMUM).<sup>29</sup> We find *eo* likewise for *ue* (or rather for a development of open *o*) before both oral and nasal consonants, and, as so employed, it constitutes another peculiarity of Anglo-Norman manuscripts; *Oxf.* and *Camb. Psalt. veolt*, *eovre*; *Roland, deol*; *Camb. Psalt. and Quatre Livres des Rois, heom, seon*,<sup>30</sup> etc. It may, at first sight, appear illogical not to consider *eo* (for *e*) and *eo* (for open *o*) together; we can easily conceive of the pronunciation *e-o* in *feorm* where the *o* may have served as a glide; we might think of the *o* of *deol* or *heom* as such a glide too from *e* to *l* or *m*. I have already indicated, however, that examples from our texts do not demonstrate

that *e* for *ue* was early or frequent enough to allow us to take it as a basis for explaining early variants of developments of open *o* (like the present *eo*, and like *oi* considered above); as we have already noted the coincidence of *u* for open *o* and *u* for close *o* without any necessary connection between the two, there is nothing abnormal implied in supposing two *eo*'s to have existed independently; in fact it is quite sure that *eo* indicated at least three different values in Anglo-Norman, *e-o*, a sound approaching *eu*, and close *e*; consequently, if we can find evidence, within the limits of open *o* developments, as to the value of the symbol in connection with open *o*, that evidence should have its weight. Now when we have so many variants for one original element, as here for open *o*, it seems to me that we should observe these variants like we do manuscripts, for example, with the hope of discovering some possible relationship among them. In order to discover the value of *eo* (for *ue*), about the only safe method is to compare other signs used for *ue* in texts in which *eo* occurs too, especially signs of known value. Those of (supposably) known value are *e* and *o*, the latter usually being understood to indicate a sound like Modern French *eu*; this value (*eu*) for *eo* was, in fact, suggested very early.<sup>31</sup> Again there is no doubt but that *eo* was used as the equivalent of a known close *e* (*cheot*, CADIT) though not in earliest Anglo-Norman;<sup>32</sup> so we might say that at one time, comparatively early, *eo* was used for *eu*; at another, later, for *e*. There is no doubt about the latter use of *eo* (for *e*), but I question the conclusiveness of the opinions that assign a value *e-o*, or *eu*, or *e* to *eo* for the earlier stages of Anglo-Norman.

Returning, then, to my idea of comparison of variants, I would suggest the following: The regular phonetic representatives of open *o* in Anglo-Norman were *o*, *ue*, *u* and *e*. The appearances of *o*, *ö*, *o* and *eo* in the manuscripts coincide; the last three are attempts of the scribes to indicate a sound of the *o* that was not the simple open *o*, nor yet the distinct diphthong *ue*, but an approach to the diphthong which the scribe did not know exactly how to designate. By the side of open *o*

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Grammatik*, p. 82.

<sup>30</sup> For texts and examples, cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia Gallica*, pp. 44-46; Suchier, *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, I, 569, *Grammatik*, p. 41; Stimming, *Boeve*, pp. 207, 208.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Koschwitz, *Ueberlieferung*, p. 29.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Grammatik*, p. 42.

and *ue* there existed an intermediate phonetic element just as between open *e* and *ie* there was a product which our scribes indicate by the indefinite *ee*. This element, doubtless a remnant of an indefinite intermediate stage for open *o*, was the one our scribes were trying to fix, and the various signs used, *ö*, *ø* and *eo* reflect their uncertainty. In my opinion *oe* may well have originated in the same way, and later have found a settled place in orthography because it happened to lend itself to the expression of a necessary distinction between *ue* and *ve*.

d. *ø*. This sign occurs in the *Cambridge Psalter*, *iløc pøple*, etc. Suchier speaks of it as indicating the sound *eu*.<sup>33</sup> Cf. my remarks above (c).

e. *ö*. Examples for this have been cited only for the *Oxford Psalter*, *pöple*, *repröce*, *öil*, *ölie*. Cf. my remarks above (c).

May I now dignify these remarks by attempting a species of summary of the results suggested?

Nowhere is the influence of individual caprice on Anglo-Norman scribes and the contradictory nature of phenomena in that dialect better illustrated than in the history of open *o*. In the face of the fact that the first authentic cases of the diphthong *ue* in any French monument are to be sought in the *Domesday Book* in the famous *Buenuasleth*, *Septmuele* and *Rainbuedcurt*,<sup>34</sup> we note, at the very outset of our study a marked fondness for the retention of simple *o* in our early texts. May it be that by the side of *ue* our scribes heard a lengthening of the *o* which they were not sure how to indicate, and that *o* where kept is so kept because they did not know how to transcribe this lengthening? May not the *o*, even when retained in the orthography have had always the diphthongal sound hinted at in the use of *ö*, *ø*, *eo* and *oe*? The early (and rare) appearance of *ö* and *ø* seems to me to point to their use for a sound unlike any other sound the scribes were accustomed to; when *ue*, *u* and *e* were definitely established, these two signs no longer present themselves. The *oe* and *eo* used in conjunction with these two, indicated the same uncertain element; but *oe* and *eo* found places in the orthography for reasons quite apart from their relation with the early

history of open *o*. Surely it must occasion less surprise that our dialect should offer a remnant of a stage in the development of open *o* than that it should show the original *o* itself so consistently and so long. Literary, or continental, influence finally decided the supremacy of *ue*, and the other signs used found no permanent place in the orthography, with the exception of *oe* (for reasons already suggested).

It seems entirely probable that *u* where found does not represent a direct passage of open *o* to *u*, but is in all cases a reduction of the diphthong *ue*.

The orthography *oi* represents a confusion of simple *o* with *oi* out of *o* before a palatal, and is to be likened to a similar confusion of *a* with *ai*, or *u* with *ui*.

The *eo*, in the early language, does not necessarily designate a sound *e-o*, or *eu*, or *e*, but is to be classed with other variants of *o* (*ö* and *ø*) as indicating an indefinite combination which existed by the side of *o* and *ue*. (No one knows better than myself that this point will be the subject of attack, but I believe it has a germ of truth in it). If *eo* were the only variant of open *o*, there would be nothing to do except to compare it with other *eo*'s in the dialect; but we find *ö* and *ø* which occur for open *o* alone; *eo* as used for *o*, then, is to be compared with them; *eu* for close and open *o* is late in Anglo-Norman, and represents the importation of scribes who happened to be well acquainted with continental French and introduced *eu* as they did *oi* (for *ei* < close *e*). Our *ö*, *ø* and *eo* probably indicated, not *eu*, but the diphthong between open *o* and *ue* already referred to.

As to *oe*, may it not have been one of these early devices for indicating the same indefinite sound, and may not its use have been to mark a distinction between *ue* and *ve* secondary?

LOUIS EMIL MENDER.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

MR. SIDNEY LEE AND SPENSER'S  
*Amoretti*.

Doubtless the radicalism of Mr. Sidney Lee's conception of the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare may be regarded as a protest against the imaginative per-

<sup>33</sup> *Gram.*, p. 41; cf. Vising, *Jhrsbrecht. Rom. Phil.* II, 1, 250.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, VIII, 359.

sonalities of the greater number of would-be picklocks of the poet's heart. Possibly, in his irritation, Mr. Lee went too far, and in rejecting virtually every tittle of a "*secretum*" in the Sonnets threw out the baby with the bath. My intention is not, however, to re-open that much-debated issue, but rather to query a side dictum of the iconoclastic Mr. Lee upon Spenser's meaning in the *Amoretti*. Mr. Lee admits somewhat grudgingly a certain amount of personal reference in these sonnets. "Some of the 'Amoretti' were doubtless addressed by Spenser in 1593 to the lady who became his wife a year later. But," Mr. Lee continues, "the sentiment was largely ideal, and, as he says in Sonnet LXXXVII., he wrote, like Drayton, with his eyes fixed on 'Idaea.'"<sup>1</sup>

Now I suppose Mr. Lee's general statement, that Spenser's "sentiment (in the *Amoretti*) was largely ideal," is as incapable of disproof as of proof. Even the discovery that Sonnet LXXXI, is identical with one by Francisco de la Torre,<sup>2</sup> does not in itself prove that Spenser might not have seen fit to include a stolen blossom in his poetical nosegay to "Elizabeth." It seems to be often assumed that a poetizing lover must be either original or no lover. If desire of public praise may tempt an author to deck himself out with a borrowed plume here and there, why may not desire of his lady's praise?

My present contention, however, is not against Mr. Lee's general dictum, safe because indeterminate, but against the particular instance which he alleges in illustration and partial proof. Mr. Lee asserts that Spenser "says in Sonnet LXXXVII., (that) he wrote, like Drayton, with his eyes fixed on 'Idaea.'" In deference, Spenser says nothing of the kind. Here is the Sonnet:

Since I have lackt the comfort of that light,  
The which was wont to lead my thoughts astray;  
I wander as in darknesse of the night,  
Affrayd of every dangers least dismay.  
Ne ought I see, though in the clearest day,  
When others gaze upon their shadowes wayne,  
But th'onely image of that heavenly ray,  
Whereof some glance doth in mine eie remayne.

<sup>1</sup> *A Life of William Shakespeare*. New York and London, 1898, p. 436.

<sup>2</sup> Fitzmaurice-Kelley, *Spanish Literature*. New York, 1898, p. 186.

Of which beholding the Idaea<sup>3</sup> playne,  
Through contemplation of my purest part,  
With light thereof I doe my selfe sustayne,  
And thereon feed my love-affamisht hart.  
But, with such brightnesse whylest I fill my mind,  
I starve my body, and mine eyes doe blynd.

Before enquiry into Spenser's meaning in this sonnet, its context in the sequence should be observed. It is one of three concluding sonnets all dwelling on his melancholy in the absence of his Love. Sonnet LXXXVI begins:

Since I did leave the presence of my Love,  
Many long weary dayes I have outworne, etc.

Sonnet LXXXVIII:

Lyke as the culver, on the bared bough,  
Sits mourning for the absence of her mate;  
So I alone, now left disconsolate,  
Mourne to myselfe the absence of my Love, etc.

Certainly these two sonnets, preceding and following, give no internal evidence of a "sentiment . . . largely ideal." In the light of them, what is the meaning of the intermediate sonnet?

Unquestionably Sonnet LXXXVII is written in Spenser's favorite Platonizing vein. The "shadowes wayne" (v. 6) plainly allude to Plato's allegory at the beginning of Book VII of the *Republic*, where he compares objects of sense to the shadows of outer realities seen by cave-dwellers. The sonnet as a whole, then, has a two-fold intention which pervades much, if not most, of the love-lyric of the renaissance. Literally, Spenser means simply to say that in the absence of his Love, he consoles himself with the thought, or idea, of her. This plain meaning, however, is crossed with that Platonic, or more properly Neo-Platonic, doctrine to which Castiglione in the *Cortegiano* (Bk. iv) gave European vogue, and which Spenser himself

<sup>3</sup> Both Morris and Grosart print "Idaea" thus capitalized. I am at loss to understand why; since, according to Morris himself (Spenser, Globe ed., p. 703), the only edition of the *Amoretti* in Spenser's lifetime, 1595, has "th'idaea; and that of 1611 has "the idaea." Hilliard (Boston, 1842) has, correctly as it would seem, "the idaea." I am not sure this capitalization, even were it Spenser's, would have any real significance. Nevertheless, it might *prima facie* seem to attach more significance to the word than the plain sense of the Sonnet otherwise would intend.



in the *Four Hymnes* (and elsewhere) develops,—very possibly after Castiglione. According to this doctrine, the sentiment of love is indeed “largely ideal,” but by no means abstract. On the contrary, the renaissance Platonist required his “Idaea” to be incarnated in an individual beautiful woman. (After Bembo and Castiglione, renaissance Platonism mainly concerned itself with one participant of Beauty—lovely woman.) For instance, John Donne, in that eminently Platonizing poem, *The Ecstasy*,<sup>4</sup> says:

So must pure lovers' souls descend  
To affections, and to faculties,  
Which sense may reach and apprehend,  
Else a great prince in prison lies.

To our bodies turn we then, that so  
Weak men on love reveal'd may look;  
Love's mysteries in souls do grow,  
But yet the body is his book.

A similar idea underlies Spenser's sonnet. While his Love was bodily present with him, her guiding light was, so to speak, duplex, emanating both from body and soul, and feeding both body and soul in him. But now the bodily current cut off, while his soul is sustained by her soul, still present with him in “idaea,” and contemplated by his “purest part,” i. e., the spiritual or intellectual, his body is starved, his eyes, lacking the light of bodily beauty, are blind. This is clear enough, surely;<sup>5</sup> and it will be observed that the very point of it is missed if we conceive Spenser writing “with his eyes fixed on ‘Idaea’,” that is, on the idea of love rather than on a concrete lovable person.

Of course, Mr. Lee is welcome, if he likes, to regard the concrete lovable person here in question another ‘she’ than Elizabeth, or a fictitious ‘not-impossible-she.’ In any case, the introduction of the word “idaea” has no bearing upon that issue whatsoever; and further, the scepticism seems a little forced. We know that there was a ‘she’ in the case with Spenser just when the Sonnets were

writing; the *G. W. Junr.* of an encomiastic sonnet-introductory refers to “thy lovely Mistresse;” it seems wanton to suppose Spenser on the eve of his marriage to “Elizabeth” in 1594 to be mixing up love-sonnets to her and to another woman; and since he had a “lovely Mistresse” in the flesh, why should he have to invent one in ‘Idaea’? There remains but one alternative; to assume that the sonnet in question was written at an earlier date. But why go out of one's way to assume?

J. B. FLETCHER.

Harvard University.

#### CURRENT NOTES IN PHONETICS.

A commission appointed by the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Vienna has attempted to solve the problem of establishing an archive of phonographic records. Its first step was to construct a disc machine on the gramophone pattern. A wax disc is rotated under the point of a speech recorder and the speech vibrations are recorded sidewise. A metal mold made from this disc is used in making impressions in a hard substance. The metal molds are to be kept in a safe place; copies are cast from them as desired. Such a speech machine was added to each of three expeditions sent out by the Vienna Academy, two philological ones to Croatia, Slavonia, and Lesbos and a geological one to Brazil. The plates finally made were fairly successful. The apparatus was found to be unwieldy.

The method used is really that controlled in this country by the patents of the Victor Talking Machine Company of Philadelphia, and in European countries by companies working under their assignments. The machine devised by the Austrian commission is a very cumbersome one in comparison with those used by the expert record-takers. It seems evident from the account that the records were taken by amateurs and not by professional experts; the art of taking perfect records is a difficult one that cannot be successfully learned by everybody. An expert record-taker, however, can make plates of a degree of perfection such as to leave nothing to be desired.

<sup>4</sup> *ἑκστασις*, in Plotinus's sense; cf. *Enn.* VI., Bk. IX., § 11.

<sup>5</sup> The second line of the sonnet certainly is not clear. It is quite against Platonist doctrine, and the general context of this sonnet, to conceive the “light” of true, i. e., spiritual, love leading the lover's “thoughts astray,”—especially as he goes on to complain that, lacking that light,—“I wander.”

The quite distorted notions of what is necessary for experimental phonetics are due largely to lack of acquaintance with laboratory methods. Large fields of work can be covered at a small expense, while some single problems require extensive funds.

For a study of tongue-action the first requirement is an artificial palate. This should be of very thin aluminum. It may be obtained by getting a dentist to make one. The gaps from missing teeth should be utilized for small projections that serve as handles to remove the palate. If no gap is present, a small wire can be imbedded in the palate and allowed to project slightly between two teeth. The inner surface is painted with blackboard paint, which takes chalk powder excellently. The amount of work to be done with the artificial palate is unlimited. A careful study of English sounds has not yet been made, and Kingsley's rather schematic palatograms still remain the only ones. The work should be extended to the problems of family and community resemblance, of the changes due to acquiring a foreign language, of the American dialects, etc., etc. Of course, a separate palate is required for each person.

For graphic records of movement a recording drum is required. For most problems the aluminum drum made under the supervision of Professor Porter of the Harvard Medical School is the most profitable investment; it is an excellent apparatus and costs only \$16. The outfit of shellac, tin pan, paper for smoking, etc., will not exceed a dollar.

For tongue and lip action three exploratory bulbs are needed; they are to be obtained from Verdin (Paris). For breath from the nose two glass nasal olives are needed. For breath from the mouth an aluminum mouth piece is readily made. The total cost does not exceed three dollars.

Two registering tambours of the best form will cost twenty dollars. The new form recently devised by Verdin is so far superior to all previous forms that it alone should be purchased.

The preceding equipment is sufficient for a very large amount of valuable investigation and demonstration. Work on speech curves, however, is a much more expensive matter.

For the phonautograph method a rapidly revolving drum of great constancy is required. Even the best phonautographs, however, seriously distort

the curves, and there is no possible test of their accuracy by turning the curve back into sound. For these reasons it would hardly be advisable to invest in one.

The phonograph and gramophone methods may be made of a high grade of accuracy. The sound itself is recorded and may be reproduced as often as desired for verification and further study. Concerning the phonograph tracing equipment I can give no figures. A gramophone equipment would include \$25 for a gramophone, and about \$100 for the machine to trace off the curves. The plates cost one dollar each. The large collections of speech in various forms, languages and dialects made by the gramophone companies in America and Europe furnish unlimited material of the most widely varied kinds. The method is so reliable and the results are so readily obtained that this is probably one of the most profitable equipments for research that could be bought. For demonstration it does not have so much value.

The sum of five hundred dollars, *properly invested*, would fit out a laboratory that in the hands of a well-trained man would be capable of doing excellent work.

The second part of Rousselot's *Principes de phonétique expérimentale* is characterized by the same ingenuity in apparatus methods as was apparent in Rousselot's previous work. The *mouillé* sounds receive the most extended treatment. A discussion of the details of the work must be left for an exhaustive review. Rousselot's work is still confined mainly to the physiology of speech sounds. The book is to be completed in another instalment.

A very interesting *Précis de prononciation française* by Rousselot and Lacleto has just appeared. This is intended as a practical book for foreigners learning the French pronunciation. The pronunciation chosen as standard is that of the cultured Parisian. A brief sketch of the vocal organs is given. Experimental aids for the learner are described; of these the artificial palate and the tambour-indicator are of approved value. The instructions for producing the vowels are illustrated by palatograms, graphic records of tongue movement and pictures of lip positions. The consonants and the combinations of sounds receive a similar

treatment. This first part of the work is as interesting as it is valuable. The second part treats of the orthography of French sounds and of *liaisons*. It ends with reading exercises in phonetic transcription, an appendix, an index of subjects and an index of words. The little book is indispensable to all who care for correct French pronunciation.

It is deeply to be regretted that two utterly different phonetic alphabets should be used by French phoneticians. Both the one used by Gilliéron, Rousselot and others and that used by the *Maître phonétique*, as organ of the *Association phonétique internationale*, are utterly unprintable without having new type cast before a single sentence can be cited. May perdition take both of them and may Heaven send along some one who will employ an alphabet based on common sense and on the possibilities of the printery!

The new international language *Esperanto* has gained popular favor in France. Courses are constantly given in Paris by the Touring Club de France. This language is intended for traveling purposes only.

Bevier has analyzed many curves traced from phonograph records. In one paper ('The vowel a', as in "hat," *Physical Review*, 1902, xiv, 171) he concludes that the American a' consists of (1) a cord-tone more or less strong according to the amount of reinforcement given to it by the mouth cavity, quite strong below 200 v. d., weak between 250 and 600, and very strong above 600; (2) a cavity tone in the region of 1550 v. d.; (3) a strong cavity tone either around 650 or around 1050, or strong cavity tones at both these regions. In a second paper ('The vowel e,' *Physical Review*, 1902, xiv, 214) states that the open e, as in *pet*, is a composite sound containing (1) the cord-tone, generally strong below 200 v. d.; weak from 200 to 600, and very strong above 600; (2) a characteristic cavity tone in the region of 1800; (3) a strong cavity tone around 620 or around 1050, or two tones at both. A third paper ('The vowel i', as in *pit*, *Physical Review*, 1902, xv, 44) states that the open i consists chiefly of (1) the cord-tone which is strong at 200 v. d. and above 500, but weak from 275 till toward 500; (2) a characteristic

cavity tone at about 1850; (3) a cavity tone at about 575. A fourth paper ('The vowel i, as in *pique*, *Physical Review*, 1902, xv, 271) states that the close i contains (1) the cord-tone; (2) a cavity tone between 1900 v. d. and 2500.

E. W. SCRIPTURE.

Yale University.

#### POINTS OF RESEMBLANCE IN THE VERSE OF TENNYSON AND THEOCRITUS.

A comparative study of the poems of Tennyson and the idyls of Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus, will show that the verse of Tennyson possesses the same musical qualities that characterize the poems of the Sicilian idyllists. Of course, Theocritus and his two Dorian brother-poets, whether in the original Greek, or in more or less altered translations, have been the delight of many succeeding poets, and, no doubt set the pace for much of the pastoral poetry that has been written since their days. But Tennyson in our own time, seems to have been the first English poet, who has been able not only to reproduce the charm of their pastoral description without borrowing their Sicilian shepherds or nymphs to complete the scene, but also to adapt to English the musical verse-structure, which is so peculiarly a characteristic of their idyllic style.

The distinctive element in the various beauties of verse-structure common to Tennyson and Theocritus is the musical repetition of words, phrases, or clauses, the same construction, often the same words, falling on the ear like the burden of a refrain. A striking illustration of the recurrence of words, and the effect on the ear when read, is Merlin's song in *The Coming of Arthur*. Another instance in point is this passage from *Lancelot and Elaine*,

And "him or death" she murmured, "death or him",  
Again and like a burthen, "him or death".

To facilitate comparison between Tennyson and Theocritus, I shall treat the subject of the similarity of the two poets in verse-structure under three heads:—(1) the repetition of words or phrases in



similarly constructed clauses or sentences; (2) the repetition of a phrase or a clause in an inverted order; and (3) the repetition of words or phrases in no regular order.

As example of the first kind might be cited the following passages from the idyls of Theocritus.

*The Singers of Pastorals* (Theoc. VIII, 28-29).

Χοῖ μὲν παῖδες ἄνσαν, ὃ δ' αἰπόλος ἦνθ' ὑπακούσας·  
χοῖ μὲν παῖδες αἶδον, ὃ δ' αἰπόλος ἤθελε κρίνειν.

'And the youths indeed shouted to him and the goatherd came, having heard them. And the youths on their part began to sing, and the goatherd was willing to be umpire.'<sup>1</sup>

*The Shepherd, or the Herdsmen* (Theoc. IX, 7-8).

Ἄδῦ μὲν ἄ μόςχος γαρύεται, ἄδῦ δὲ χά βῶς,  
ἄδῦ δὲ χά σύριγξ, χά βοκόλος· ἄδῦ δὲ κήγῶν.

'Sweetly indeed the calf lows, and sweetly, too, does the heifer, and sweetly also the pipe sounds, and the herdsman, and sweetly I, too.'

*The Bacchanals* (Theoc. XXVI, 15).

Μαίνεται μὲν τ' αὐτά, μαίνοντο δ' ἄρ' εὐθὺ καὶ ἄλλαι.

'Maddened indeed was she, and maddened, I ween, also were the others.'

*Thyrsis, or the Lay* (Theoc. I, 71-72).

Τῆνον μὲν θῶες, τῆνον λύκοι ὠρύσαντο,  
τῆνον χῶκ δρυμοῖο λέων ἐκλαυσε θανόντα.

'Him indeed the panthers, him the wolves bewailed. For him, when dead, even the lion from the thicket wept aloud.'

In Tennyson there are many passages which show an identity of structure with those just cited. Let the following few serve as specimens.

*The Lotus-Eaters.*

"But evermore

Most weary seemed the sea, weary the oar,  
Weary the wandering fields of barren foam."

"The Lotus blooms below the barren peak,  
The Lotus blows by every winding creek."

<sup>1</sup>The translation of the passages of Theocritus, here cited, is from the prose version of Theocritus, Bion and Moschus, by the Rev. J. Banks, M. A., in Bohn's Classical Library.

*Love and Duty.*

"The slow sweet hours that bring us all things good,  
The slow sad hours that bring us all things ill."

*The Holy Grail.*

"This Holy Thing. . . . .

Fainter by day, but always in the night  
Blood-red, and sliding down the blacken'd marsh  
Blood-red, and on the naked mountain top  
Blood-red, and in the sleeping mere below  
Blood-red."

*The Princess*

"And call her Ida, tho' I knew her not,  
And call her sweet, as if in irony,  
And call her hard and cold which seemed a truth."

The second beauty of verse-structure that Tennyson has in common with the Sicilian poets, consists in the repetition of a clause in the manner of these passages from *Oenone* :—

"My eyes are full of tears, my heart of love,  
My heart is breaking, and my eyes are dim."

"Aloft the mountain lawn was dewy-dark  
And dewy-dark aloft the mountain pine."

The *Choric Song* contains the beautiful line

"Give us long rest or death, dark death or dreamful ease."

As the analogues in structure to these passages may be adduced the following, taken from among others in the Dorian idyls.

*The Shepherd, or the Herdsmen* (Theoc. IX, 1-2).

Βωκολιάσδεο, Δάφνι· τὸν δ' ᾠδᾶς ἄρχεο πρᾶτος,  
ᾠδᾶς ἄρχεο πρᾶτος, ἐφεισάσθω δὲ Μενάλκας.

'Sing a pastoral strain, Daphnis, and do you first begin the song; begin you the song first, and let Menalcas follow after.'

*The Bacchanals* (Theoc. XXVI, 30).

Αὐτὸς δ' εὐαγέοιμι καὶ εὐαγέεσσιν ᾄδοιμι.

'But may I be pure and simple and please the pure and simple.'

*Epitaph of Adonis* (Bion I, 1-2).

Αἰάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν· ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις.

ᾠλετο καλὸς, Ἄδωνις, ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἐρωτες.

'I wail for Adonis; beauteous Adonis is dead. Dead is beauteous Adonis; the Loves join in the wail.'

88-91.

Οὐκ ἔτι δ' Ὑμᾶν,  
 Ὑμᾶν οὐκ ἔτ' αἰδόμενον μέλος, ᾄδεται αἱ αἶ.  
 Αἱ αἶ καὶ τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἔτι πλέον, ἢ Ὑμέναιος,  
 αἱ Χάριτες κλαίοντι—etc.

'And no more is Hymen, no more Hymen the song that is sung; alas! alas! is chanted: alas! alas! for Adonis wail the Graces, far more than Hymenaeus.'

The third species of verse-structure, very common to both Tennyson and the Sicilian poets, is the frequent repetition of words with a view rather to a strictly musical than any rhetorical effect. It is primarily a lyrical trick, and as such found oftenest in poems of a lyrical character. Tennyson has employed it most happily in the lyrics scattered throughout *The Idylls of the King* and *The Princess*, especially the song of Merlin, *The Swallow Song* and *Tears, Idle Tears*. But even in poems where the narrative element predominates, the singing muse of Tennyson breaks forth in passages like the following:

*The Gardener's Daughter.*

"But all else of Heaven was pure  
 Up to the sun, and May from verge to verge,  
 And May with me from head to heel."

*The Holy Grail.*

"My knight, my love, my knight of heaven,  
 O thou my love, whose love is one with mine,  
 I maiden, round thee, maiden, bind my belt."

*The Princess.*

"And come, for love is of the valley, come,  
 For love is of the valley, come thou down  
 And find him."

The two refrains in *Thyrsis*, or the *Lay* shows this same repetition, viz:—

Ἀρχετε βωκολικᾶς, Μῶσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' αἰοιδᾶς,  
 and

Λήγετε βωκολικᾶς, Μῶσαι, ἴτε, λήγετ' αἰοιδᾶς.

This species of repetition is, furthermore, abundant in the exquisite elegies which the Sicilian poets have bequeathed to us. The well-known "Epitaph of Adonis" has furnished the following specimens.

*Epitaph of Adonis, 7-8.*

Κεῖται καλὸς Ἀδωνις ἐπ' ὄρεσι, μηρὸν ὀδόντι  
 λευκῷ λευκὸν ὀδόντι τυπεῖς

'Low lies beauteous Adonis on the mountains,  
 having his white thigh smitten by a tusk, a white tusk.'

37-39.

Αἱ αἶ τὰν Κυθέρειαν, ἀπάλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις.  
 Ἀχὼ δ' ἀντεβόασεν, ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις.  
 Κύπριδος αἶνὸν ἔρωτα τίς οὐκ ἔκλανσεν ἄν; αἱ αἶ.

'Alas alas for Cytherea, beauteous Adonis hath perished.  
 And echo cried in response, "Beauteous Adonis hath perished."

Who would not have lamented the dire love of Venus?  
 Alas, Alas.'

94.

Καὶ Μοῦσαι τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἀνακλαίουσιν Ἀδωνιν.

'The Muses, too, strike up the lament for Adonis,  
 Adonis.'

The beauties of verse-structure here indicated as common to Tennyson and the Dorian poets, may not be so peculiarly Tennysonian as not to be found in other poets. Our own American poet, Poe, has made some of his verse ripple with musical repetitions and the recurrence of melodious sounds. But Poe's repetitions, even when the most musical, have not the delicate finish of those we meet in Tennyson. Poe's music is of a very different sort from Tennyson's as the temperament of Poe differed radically from that of Tennyson. The rhythm in the Sicilian idylls, however, and the repetition of words and clauses that help to make them musical show a great degree of similarity with the rhythm and melody of Tennyson's verse.

FRANCIS J. HEMELT.

*The Catholic University.*

ALLOTRIA III.

Professor Skeat has, on various occasions, laid to rest what he calls "ghost-words." I should like to exorcise one or two more.

1. *prȳdo*, or *Mōdprȳdo*, as a *nominative*, in the discussion of *Beow*. 1931. The manuscript is perfectly plain: *mod prȳdo wæz*; the metre also requires a dissyllable, = ˘ ˘ x | ˘. The leading

investigators of the Beowulf-legend, Müllenhoff and ten Brink,—Sarrazin does not touch upon this point,—speak of a queen *prȳðo*; see Müllenhoff, *Beow. Untersuchungen* 74, 81, etc., ten Brink, *Beow. Untersuchungen* 116, also Suchier, *Beiträge* iv, 500. Holder's Glossary sets up the nominative *prȳðo*, also Heyne, in his list of names, and Wyatt.

What right has any one, may I ask, to so much as dream of a nominative singular *prȳðo* in the English of *Beowulf*? Sievers has given the only correct form *ðrȳð* in every edition of his grammar, § 269; whoever may cherish any doubt need only consult Sweet, *OET*. 638 and the texts there cited. Not one instance of *-ðrȳðe* except in an oblique case! Whatever may be the correct interpretation of *Beow.* 1931, we shall not arrive at it by starting from an impossible nominative singular, *ðrȳðo*.

2. In his earliest paper on the Beowulf myth, *Zs. f. d. A.* vii, 421 note, Müllenhoff attempts to explain the Beanstan of *Beow.* 524 as a giant-name "altn. *bauni* bezeichnet eine art haifisch; vergl. ags. *Hvala*, altn. *Hvala* Sn. 209<sup>b</sup>." This view he repeats in his *Beow. Untersuchungen*, p. 2: "der name des Vaters, Beanstan, scheint auf die see und seeungeheuer zu deuten (vgl. altn. *bauni* walfisch)." Müllenhoff's view seems to have enjoyed also the approval of Zupitza. See his review of Holder's ed. of *Beow.*, in the *Deut. Litt. Ztg.*, vi, 489-90: "aber an derselben stelle [*Zs. f. d. A.* vii, 421] hat Müllenhoff doch auch die Möglichkeit einer anderen Erklärung angedeutet, welche weder Bugge noch Krüger der Beachtung gewürdigt haben."

Icelandic *bauni* 'whale' would undoubtedly be a most convenient word for the Beanstan of *Beowulf*. But where is it to be found? I have looked for it in vain in the dictionaries of Vigfusson, Fritzner, Egilsson, Gering, Larsson, and the supplements by Thorkelsson.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

#### ITALIAN LITERATURE.

*Dante and the Animal Kingdom*, by RICHARD THAYER HOLBROOK, Ph. D. New York: the Columbia University Press, Macmillan Company, agents, 1902. 8vo., pp. xix, 376.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Criticisms which appeared in the *Giorn. Stor. d. Lett. It.* and *The Athenæum* after the present review was completed agree with it substantially, and, like the somewhat

A study of Dante's references to the animal world is important, not merely for the understanding of Dante, but for the light it throws on the scientific ideas of the Middle Ages. The most comprehensive work yet published on the subject is Dr. Holbrook's, which is handsomely and accurately printed, with a number of appropriate illustrations. Like other books bearing the imprint of the Columbia University Press, it shows that the results of a scientific investigation can be presented in readable form. Yet we cannot help feeling that in striving to be rigidly scholarly and at the same time avoid heaviness and dryness, Dr. Holbrook has not seldom fallen between two stools. Much of his material, indispensable if the work is to appeal to specialists, can be understood by no one else; while on the other hand, important assertions are made with no reference to authority, or with such references as: "one Italian asserts" (p. 96); "some one has suggested" (p. 99). Moreover, the serious student does not find fulfilled the promise that "an adequate bibliography will be found in the notes." Many quotations are given at second-hand,—*"Villani cited by Toynbee," "Gelli quoted by Vernon,"* or without any indication as to whether the sources have been consulted or not. One looks in vain for any statement about the editions of various often-quoted mediæval writers, such as Boccaccio, who is cited in two ways; as, "nov. 98, 36," and, "g. 7, f. 2;" some search has failed either to identify these references, or to discover why two systems are used. Even full references are not always to the standard editions; for instance, the *Bestiary* of Guillaume le Clerc is cited in the edition of Hippeau, 1852, not that of Reinsch, 1892. Many important authorities are not cited at all. Obviously, wide and thorough knowledge of mediæval literature and of modern critical works is required for the successful investigation of this subject; it is not enough merely to look up references. Dr. Holbrook has evidently worked diligently; but he betrays superficiality, without suspecting it, when he mentions as a noteworthy exception something that is a commonplace of mediæval lore. On the whale, for instance, he has this to say (p. 204):

more favorable reviews in *The Nation* and elsewhere, add considerably to the list of mistakes here given.

K. McK.



"He is not regularly a part of the fabulous lore of those times; yet Brunetto Latini tells a tale which smacks so strongly of folklore that it can reasonably be thought to represent an opinion current in Dante's time." The tale is the familiar one of sailors who take the whale's back for an island; Dr. Holbrook apparently overlooked it even in Guillaume le Clerc (ed. Reinsch, 2203 ff.). On the authority of Lauchert, he states that Guido delle Colonne and Messer Polo compare their mistresses to the panther; but he does not appear to have read their poems, nor the sonnet of Chiaro Davanzati, "Sicome la Pantera per alore," nor indeed any of the Italian lyric poetry prior to Dante. This is a serious omission, for it is well known that this poetry abounds in comparisons drawn from the animal world. In some cases an apparent lack of information is no doubt due to carelessness of statement, as when St. Ambrose is made to follow Isidor (p. 67); and in this: "According to the Gospel of St. Mark Jesus wrought miraculous cures" (p. 39). In regard to Dante's sources, Dr. Holbrook does not offer much that is new except in bringing together and classifying the material. Apparently he might have given credit even oftener than he does to works like those of Toynbee, Moore, and Tozer. One misses an introductory chapter which should give a connected account of the books used by Dante as scientific authorities. There should be an index showing in textual order the passages commented on. A knowledge of Italian is not assumed, for quotations are given in English, though usually accompanied by the original text. It would have been better to use more frequently the translations of Longfellow and Norton; Dr. Holbrook prefers the highly poetical translation of Parsons, and has corrected some of the mistakes in it; he should have corrected also "shakes the road" (p. 59), for *move cìd ch'ei tocca*, and "empyrean" (p. 261), where the sphere of fire is meant. Occasionally he gives his own translation, and then is not always correct, as in rendering *tempo* by "hour" instead of "season" (p. 9), and *gaietta* by "pretty" instead of "spotted" (p. 90—cf. *Arch. Glott.* xv, 286). "That most bland Boccaccio" (p. 99), is his rendering of Benvenuto's *suavissimus*. He gives few etymologies; his theory for *nibbio* (popular confusion of *milvus* and *nebula*, "for the kite flies

near the clouds," p. 254) seems to be due to Körting's dubious suggestion. "The fourth bolgia of Hell" (p. 96), should read: "the fourth bolgia of the eighth circle of Hell." The *Anonimo Fiorentino*, correctly cited on p. 206, is on p. 154 mistaken for the Italian version of Bambaglioli, ed. Vernon, 1848. On p. 312 the statement about Philomela is exactly the opposite of what was evidently meant.

Arranged roughly on a zoölogical basis, the book takes up Man, the Angels, the Devils, and then sixty or more beasts, birds, and fishes. For the inclusion of men and devils among animals there is of course warrant in Dante's own words; yet some readers might cavil at the separate treatment of all the demons in the *Inferno*. Dr. Holbrook does not decide between Pluto and Plutus as the source of Dante's Pluto,—"a devil whose shape is monstrous, but as impossible to define as his uncouth language" (p. 51). Nevertheless, he gives a new suggestion for interpreting the verse *Inf.* vii, 1. *Pape* is an exclamation of surprise, *Satan* the devil's name, and *aleppe* the Hebrew *aleph*,—so say many commentators. Dr. Holbrook, recalling that Christ is sometimes called after the first letter of the alphabet, suggests that Pluto merely used this symbol of Christ's name in blasphemy, which "would be natural in a demon. All the infernal functionaries could hardly fail to gather many oaths from the cosmopolitan throng of sinners." Surely, of all the unsatisfactory interpretations that have been offered, none is more grotesquely impossible than this. Geryon's function in Hell "is a puzzle which Dante leaves to an already strained imagination," (p. 66); yet in the similar case of Phlegyas, Dr. Holbrook makes a doubtful statement (p. 53), on the authority of Tozer (he might have added Scartazzini). On the whole, however, the easily available researches of others made this part of the book, some seventy-five pages, comparatively plain sailing. Chapter v, a general introduction to all that follows, is entitled "The Lower Animals." Later, Dr. Holbrook sarcastically condemns his own word "lower" as applied to animals (p. 157). He cannot make Dante responsible for the use of "bestial" or "inhuman" to characterize a wrong or unnatural condition in man; but he reprimands him for following it, saying that it "scarcely

betokens profound knowledge of man's nature or of that of the beasts" (p. 81). Even in its context, this is amusing: "Once, at least, Dante seems to have hit upon the truth" (p. 82). Evidently, "the adulation engendered in small minds by Dante's greatness" (p. 98) is not going to lead Dr. Holbrook astray, and we finish chapter v with misgivings as to the treatment Dante is to receive in the rest of the book; and, indeed, he is made out, not so much a Homer who nods, as a Rip van Winkle who is occasionally awakened from his intellectual sleep by a flash of "heresy." To be sure, Dr. Holbrook declares that there is an abyss between the poet and the dogmatist in Dante; but he is not consistent in carrying out the distinction, which is in any case an impossible one. We can imagine saying to him, innocently: "That man looks like a ghost;" and being met with: "You poor deluded fool, do you believe in ghosts?" This is the treatment to which he constantly subjects Dante, who after all was not writing a text-book of natural science, but was treating his conception of the universe under the form of a poetical allegory. Dr. Holbrook has not quite decided whether to tell us about animals or about Dante, whose mind is certainly worth studying for its own sake, and also as a type. Of course, in his scientific statements, Dante did exactly as we do,—followed the best available authorities. It does not seem particularly important to point out every one of his scientific mistakes, yet even this might have been done without a show of patronizing contempt. Dr. Holbrook's real ability in hitting upon striking phrases is often perverted by a desire to be startling or picturesque. What shall we say of this, for instance?—"the artist's unwitting dismissal of his dogma as to the fishes' intelligence must delight all who have a mind" (p. 217). The inference is that Dante had none, except perhaps "unwittingly;" but as a matter of fact, in this particular case there is no sufficient ground for saying that the dogma is dismissed. Dr. Holbrook adopts a particularly flippant tone when speaking of the Bible; although he is not familiar enough with it to avoid the blunder of saying "straight and narrow path" (p. 85). He speaks of "lions stricken with lockjaw for the benefit of Daniel;" "the nightmare of the Apocalypse;" he enforces his opinion in and out

of season that the stories of the Bible are legends. "Anthropocentric" is the most crushingly scornful word in his vocabulary. Now this irrelevant though obtrusive feature of the book would not call for special notice if it did not seem to show a lamentable lack of sympathy between the author and his subject,—a lack which is by no means the necessary consequence of a difference of theological views. It may be said that enough unintelligent praise has been lavished on Dante; but why take delight in going to the other extreme? We would not deny that Dr. Holbrook's book shows an earnest purpose, and is worthy of being taken seriously. In matters of detail it is often interesting and instructive. But much of it is vitiated by an unfortunate attitude of mind; and in a student of Dante surely the least pardonable of all faults is flippancy.

The first individual animal treated is the monkey, whom Dante and his contemporaries regard as "a kind of imitative caricature of man" (p. 85). It is not easy to see why Dr. Holbrook says that "by chance" the Sardinian words quoted in the *De V. E.*, I, XI are the same as Latin words; Dante chose them for that very reason. The next chapters discuss the three beasts of *Inf.* I. Of these only the *lonza* offers special difficulty. This word has usually been translated panther or leopard; Dante had in mind the *pardus* of *Jeremiah*, v, 6. Dr. Holbrook translates *lonza* by "ounce," as only Butler has done before him; "panther," as he says, is not correct, for this animal had in the Middle Ages distinct traditional characteristics; these names are, in fact, "hardly more than mere words about which have clustered various legends." There seems to be little use, then, in insisting on the translation "ounce;" Dante undoubtedly chose the word *lonza* for the alliteration, and because it corresponded to *pardus* better than *lince* would have done; yet the typical quality of the lynx, envy, is without doubt the allegorical significance of the *lonza* of Dante. Dr. Holbrook is not clear on this point; he seems to think that the *lonza* cannot symbolize envy, since the wolf stands for envious greed. But he ascribes too much to the wolf, which symbolizes greed merely, while the lion is pride. Unfortunately, he has missed the one discussion concerning the three beasts that he ought to have used,—D'Ovidio's, in his *Studii*

*sulla Div. Com.*, 1901; it would have settled for him some of the questions that he has left unsolved. The lion in Dante offers no difficulty. Dr. Holbrook points out that Dante did not know how lions attack their prey; but from seeing them in cages he could hardly be expected to know this. On the other hand, he might easily have known how Sordello looked, though Dr. Holbrook regards this as unlikely. Except for the absurd sentence that concludes it (p. 108), the chapter on the lion is good, and so is also the following one, on the wolf. Yet both here, and in speaking of the dog, Dr. Holbrook implies that the "excessive" use of allegory shows ignorance of natural facts,—a conclusion that does not follow. Dante shows no familiarity with the fox as hero of the beast-epic, but treats him as the symbol of fraud, as Cicero and others had done before. Dr. Holbrook's explanation of *Purg.*, xiv, 54 (p. 128), which he appears to think new, is given by Fraticelli. On the mouse nothing new is offered, except perhaps the idea that Dante's scene of the quarreling demons in *Inf.* xxii was suggested to him by the Æsopic fable; but this is hardly consistent with the statement that the description bears only a superficial similarity to the fable. In the Latin fable quoted (pp. 138-9), Dr. Holbrook has misunderstood *opem*, which here means aid, rather than treasure. In the chapter on the mole he makes the surprising admission (for him) that "Dante seems usually to have kept pace with science." But it is to be noted that this alleged scientific discovery of Dante's depends on an interpretation of *Purg.*, xvii, 3, which is not certain. At times Dr. Holbrook is enthusiastic over Dante's power of describing what he has seen; but he berates him for "humanising" the bear by comparing him to a pope, and for believing the story of Elisha, which is of course not zoölogy but literature, whether it be believed or not. At the beginning he states that "Dante derived his knowledge of the animal kingdom largely from his own observation" (p. 6); but he hardly bears out this statement in the rest of the work. Indeed, it does not seem to us that he has consistently or correctly drawn the distinction between Dante's conventional treatment of nature and his observation; Professor Kuhn has drawn it better in his less pretentious book; and Dante's distinction

between fact and fiction in historical matters is clearly brought out by Professor Grandgent in his *Dante and St. Paul*, in *Romania*, xxxi.

Dr. Holbrook is at his best in the chapters on birds. On fowling and falconry in particular he gives much useful information and interesting comment; for instance, he points out that *rotto*, *Inf.* xxii, 132, which has usually been misunderstood, is used with the meaning "ruffled" in an old Italian bird-book. He believes that "if any phase of animal existence is portrayed by Dante in a masterly way, it is to be found in his pictures of hawks;" and this is no doubt the reason why he here treats Dante more sympathetically than elsewhere. Falconry was accounted the noblest of sports in the Middle Ages, and, like other kinds of hunting, had an important literature. Dr. Holbrook might have found additional information in the articles on hunting-books by Werth, *Zeitschrift f. R. P.*, vols. xii and xiii. His note (p. 237): "Lacroix fails to give the page," makes one wonder whether he had access to the Book of King Modus and Queen Racio, either in an old edition or in that of Blaze (1839). However, the quotations from this book, and from those of Frederick II and of Albertus Magnus (whom he refers to under a confusing variety of names), are interesting. After birds come reptiles and insects. On p. 340 Dr. Holbrook points out a parallel, which he promises to discuss elsewhere, between *Inf.* vi, 22-24 and one of the Penitential Psalms (Oxford *Dante*, p. 193). Finally comes a short chapter of general conclusions.

The reviewer hopes to have made evident by these criticisms, which could be largely extended, that the book cannot be unreservedly either praised or blamed. The aim "to set forth Dante's whole philosophy of the animal kingdom" is accomplished in so far as every pertinent passage in Dante's works is discussed; many of the general conclusions are sound, although some problems are left unsolved. But, after beginning bravely with the purpose of looking at the world from Dante's point of view, Dr. Holbrook proves unable to follow consistently this only rational method of treating the subject. He not only never forgets the present, but is entirely out of sympathy with the scientific and philosophical ideas of Dante's age, showing no interest in them for their own



sake. Furthermore, though it will be useful to students, the book leaves much to be desired in scholarly thoroughness and accuracy, and also, occasionally, in good taste. Having approached with the most favorable expectations the unsought task of judging it, the reviewer confesses that he has been in turn gratified, surprised, and irritated to a degree that makes the task complex and far from easy.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.

Yale University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Der Traum, ein Leben*, dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen von FRANZ GRILLPARZER, edited by EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER, Western Reserve University; Boston, Heath & Co., 1902.

It would be interesting to trace out the distribution over the field of German literature of the multitude of annotated texts that have appeared in America since the study of the modern languages began to vie with that of the classics. Such an investigation would show a strange jumble of works, big and little, of apparently haphazard selection, aside from the inevitable group Lessing-Goethe-Schiller. To anyone who looked at the list from the systematic point of view, as a literary historian, it would appear equally puzzling for its strange sins of omission and for its astonishing sins of commission. Under the former head, the long neglect of Grillparzer would be one of the most surprising phenomena. But the day of Grillparzer as a school classic has come at last. In 1899, Professor Ferrell presented his edition of *Sappho*; now Professor Meyer gives us *Der Traum, ein Leben*; and there are rumors of more than one imminent edition of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, which, perhaps, deserved the first place instead of the third.

The edition of *Der Traum, ein Leben* has many excellent qualities that are none too common, and the combination of which is quite rare. It shows an intimate acquaintance with the personality and the works of the author, and familiarity with the literature on the subject. It reveals literary sense, and warm sympathy with the work studied and with its author. It is intelligent, and quite free

from prolixity and overediting. The adverse criticisms that may be suggested are due largely to the fact that this edition has the defects of its qualities.

The brief Introduction, covering only 33 pages, gives a rapid review of Grillparzer's life, work, and character, and studies the play itself, mainly from the point of view of dynamic criticism, with particular reference to autobiographical and literary influences. The sources are given quite fully, with some new material—new, at least, to the reviewer; this part of the study is so detailed that it does not appear why a few minor sources are left unnoticed, for example, some of those that Professor R. M. Meyer mentions in his interesting article in the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, v, 430 f.

The brevity of the Introduction is a virtue; but in some instances it involves a conciseness that, considering the readers for whom the book is intended, amounts to obscurity. The student will be puzzled to know why Grillparzer compared Schreyvogel to Lessing (p. viii), and what it means to write an autobiography "in accordance with the statutes of the Academy of Science" (p. xv). The comparison of *Sappho* with *Tasso*, and of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* with *Iphigenie*, calls for explanation (p. xvii), and it should be stated where Sudermann's *Salome* is to be found. Here, too, some space could profitably be given to the history of plays of the Raimund type on the Viennese stage, and also of the opera, which is so important a source of certain elements in *Der Traum, ein Leben*. On p. xxi, the phrase "artist *par excellence*" should be carefully explained; as it stands, it is quite misleading, if it suggests anything at all definite to the student; so, too, with the "broad rhetoric" of Calderon and Schiller and the "exquisite art" of Lope and Goethe, and the "unique style" of Grillparzer (p. xxii). In this connection, a few details may be referred to that appear inexact or misleading. The antithesis of the "broad German farcical comedy" and the "fine French comedy" (p. xiv) is hardly fair. Corneille is certainly not a good example of the "predominance of the love element" (p. xvii), and if Schiller's "lines" were narrower than Grillparzer's (p. xviii—it should be explained how), the impression ought not to be given that Schiller did not care for "ideal eternal types and

the inner world." It is hardly correct to say that Goethe reached "the self-same solution" as Grillparzer (p. xx); their conceptions of "resignation" were of course vitally different. The characterization of the dramatis personæ (p. xxxi f.) is so brief that it does not differentiate clearly enough between the characters as they are primarily conceived by the poet and as they become in the fancy of the dreaming hero, and yet this transformation is one of the subtlest and most successful artistic effects of the play, to which the student should have his attention called quite explicitly. It might be noted here (p. xxxii) that old Caleb's name as well as his personality is reminiscential; it is the name of the hunter whom Mirza sees returning home in the first scene.

At the end of the Introduction, there is a somewhat confusing interblending of technical analysis and interpretation. This part has suffered most from the editor's self-limitation. It is hardly fair, perhaps, to demand a complete critical analysis in the introduction to a school edition, and such an analysis might even, in certain respects, be unpedagogical. But the question of style once being introduced, the subject should perhaps have been treated with some fulness—with reference, for example, to the diction, the lyric and descriptive elements, the comparative lack of dramatic shading, and the general qualities of style; an interesting detail—especially in comparison with Goethe's *Faust*—is the lack of humor. Then there are other technical questions about as important as that of the dramatic structure (in which connection *anti-climax* as a technical term is unfamiliar to the reviewer). The metrical and rhythmical quality of the work might well have been analyzed, for in this respect Grillparzer's art is peculiarly capricious and uncertain. The rhyme, with its curious distribution, often apparently accidental or negligent, is especially interesting; about forty per cent of all the lines are rhymed, and it would be interesting to compare the number and distribution of these lines with the rhymes of the *Ahnfrau*, and to contrast with them the dramas in pentameters. So far as the structure of the drama is concerned, a reference to the romantic device of the play within the play, particularly to Tieck's use of it, would be in order; the dream play is a specialized form of this device.

The sympathetic enthusiasm of the editor is another virtue that tends somewhat to excess, in a certain quality of exaggeration that pervades some of the critical judgments. Thus *Der arme Spielmann* is called "a remarkable story," and "one of the most pathetic in the world's literature," and again "one of the most perfect and pathetic tales in all literature." It is a good deal to say that "there is no more exquisite art in all dramatic literature" than that of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, and at least it should be noted that the most exquisite art of this drama is rather lyric than dramatic. It would be pertinent, by the way, in connection with this love tragedy, to note the pallor of the love element in *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Again, the figure of the heroine in *Die Jüdin von Toledo* is called "perfect of its kind," *Libussa* "a wonderful play," with "superb symbolism," and Mirza is designated as "wonderful." So, in the note to l. 1857, the scene of the two wine-cups receives excessive praise as "a wonderful presentation of the awful delirium of a fearful dream." It may seem pedantic to touch upon this point at all, as it is largely a matter of temperament; but a pedagogical principle is involved, for quite apart from the bias of such expressions, they are usually so general that they tend to confuse rather than to clarify the student's critical perception.

The Notes also give evidence of the editor's self-restraint, limited as they are in general to the absolutely essential. Here again the lines are perhaps drawn a little too closely, but it is certainly far better to err on this side than to follow the convenient dictionary and interlinear method. The subtle art of the double action is well elucidated in succinct explanatory notes. The real difficulties of the text are cleared up quite sufficiently, in the main; but there remain a few constructions puzzling to the student that might be explained, as l. 310, 695 f., 1076 f., 1252 f., 1670, 2248 f., 2420 f. The following remarks and emendations suggest themselves: l. 93, *foreshadows* is preferable to *presages* as a technical term, and l. 242, *figure* better than *picture*.—l. 262 is a direct quotation from Psalms xxxvii, 3.—l. 275, *Heldenbrauch* would better be translated "the way of heroes."—l. 283 f. seems like a distinct reminiscence of Goethe's *Faust*.—l. 361, *da drin* might be interpreted.—l. 438, the elusive *eins* would be better

rendered by an interrogatory form, as "Who will explain?"—l. 1169, of rather than *from*.—l. 1447, the *halbverschossenen Knochen* certainly refer to Rustan's own bones, if he gained his preferment by honest promotion from the ranks and ended his life as a shattered *invalid*.—l. 1817\*, whose conscience stings? Certainly not that of the murdered man whom the adder is biting.—l. 1842 f., reminiscence of Voss' familiar poem *Die Spinnerin: Bald schnurrt das Rädchen, Bald läuft das Fädchen*. Is not this a Volkslied motif?—l. 2263 f., cf. ll. 1265, 1268.—l. 2289, it should be said, perhaps, that the motif of a mute breaking into speech is very old, at least as old as Herodotus. Other details in this scene seem to point directly to *Titus Andronicus*. The student will not gather, from the title *Die Stumme von Portici*, that Auber was a French composer.—l. 2399 is proverbial.—l. 2721, worship of the sun is not Islamitic, but Zoroastrian.

The proof-reading of the volume is exceptionally good. Only one error was noted in the text itself:—l. 1884 should not be indented. Other misprints occur as follows: p. xxiii, *Commedia*; p. xxvi, *Melusina*, and l. 5 from below, *is told*; p. xxviii, *presentiment*, *Barmeciden*. In the Notes, to l. 31, *iezuo*; to l. 1169, should read 1168; to l. 2657, fill in page. The style is occasionally somewhat careless, and a book for students ought to be faultless in this matter; so p. xiii, *with whom he had no sympathy in Berlin*; also *to correspond* (and by the way, why should Goethe be called "the old seer?"); p. xix, *rise . . . to queen*; p. xxvii, *pawning to an Armenian the diamond*; p. xxviii, *trick to leave*; p. xxxii, *Old Kaleb is from the Derwisch*.

A good piece of work or an important drama has a right to be criticized closely; but let the last word of the critic be one of general appreciation of a piece of work that is well done.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*The Treatment of Nature in German Literature from Günther to the appearance of Goethe's Werther*, by MAX BATT. Diss. Chicago, 1902.

*The Treatment of Nature in the Works of Nikolaus Lenau*, by CAMILLO VON KLENZE. Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, 1902. Vol. 7.

These two contributions to the rapidly growing literature on the treatment of nature by the poets and prose writers of different epochs evidently owe their inspiration to Alfred Biese's stimulating work: *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (1888) in which he gives a continuation of his treatment of the same subject among the Greeks and Romans.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the evident mastery of the subject and the brilliancy of the style, one feels at times the sketchiness of the treatment in Biese's work due to the attempt to cover so tremendous a field in the compass of one volume. There is ample room for detailed studies of individual writers or epochs to fill out the outlines given by Biese. It is evidently with this idea in mind that the monographs of Batt and von Klenze were written.

Unfortunately in the case of the former, the epoch chosen was too long to admit of being satisfactorily treated within the limits of a dissertation, and although the author probably started with the idea of making good the deficiencies which are especially apparent in the sections of Biese's book dealing with the first half of the eighteenth century, he has given us a treatment which is on the whole scarcely more detailed than that of Biese. This is especially true of the earlier poets Brookes and Haller, but also of Gessner, Cramer and Klopstock. The writers of the Anacreontic school and the poets of the Hainbund on the other hand receive a longer treatment, although one misses among the former the name of Cronegk and among the latter Boie, both of whom Biese mentions.

As Batt carefully avoids repeating the examples and the opinions of Biese, his dissertation deserves the credit of being considered an independent study and will form a useful supplement to the corresponding chapter in Biese. It has the advantage of greater clearness of arrangement, since each poet is treated of under a separate rubric. The question may, however, be properly asked, whether Batt would not have done better if he had

<sup>1</sup> *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen und Römern*, Kiel, 1882.



confined himself to one school, say to the poets of the Hainbund, and had furnished us with a really detailed treatment of the subject. The histories of literature are full of generalities upon the attitude of the various poets towards nature. What we want is detailed work, the collection of statistics, as it were, upon which to base an accurate judgment.

When one compares Batt's treatment with that of Biese one can not say that he has thrown any new light upon the attitude of the poets in question to nature. In fact one is strongly tempted to apply to the author the same words with which he so severely criticized the study of A. B. Cooke: *On the Development of the Nature-Sense in the German Lyric*.<sup>2</sup> After such remarks which we can not quote here for lack of space, but to which we would refer the reader, it was, to say the least, very ungenerous on Batt's part to omit in his bibliography, which apparently tries to be exhaustive, any mention of Cooke's essay.

In dealing with Albrecht von Haller, Batt has hardly done justice to the poet's descriptions of nature. They are to be sure rather labored, but at the same time not devoid of considerable feeling and power. Scherer says of *Die Alpen*: 'Natur- und Menschenschilderung voll Wahrheit und Sprachgewalt,' and this well expresses the general opinion. Because of his religious struggles it was only natural that Haller should have been attracted by the more primitive, and as he thought, purer life of the Swiss peasants and that he should devote a large portion of his poem to them. At the same time nature is not quite so completely forgotten as Batt would have us think. The poem in question, which consists of four hundred and eighty lines, contains a passage of one hundred and thirty lines devoted entirely to the description of the scenery without any mention of the inhabitants. The phraseology is to be sure somewhat conventional and the introduction of mythological names distasteful to us, but this was a heritage of the seventeenth century, which poetry was only then beginning to throw off. Haller was fond of commencing his didactic poems with a description of nature and in some of his minor poems, such as *Doris*, he has succeeded very well in describing the gradual approach of evening.

<sup>2</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, Dec. 1901 (col. 487-490).

Ramler, although a poet better known for his correctness of form than for poetic inspiration, deserves more than the passing allusion to his praise of skating, which Batt gives. His poem *Sehnsucht nach dem Winter* breathes a genuine love of nature and shows real appreciation of the beauties of a wintry landscape.

In the treatment of Werther one looks in vain for any mention of the name of Klopstock, whose influence Goethe himself clearly indicates in the scene at the dance, where both Lotte and Werther are reminded of a "glorious ode" of Klopstock by the sight of a thunderstorm.

On page 44 the author expresses surprise that in the case of both Klopstock and Thomson "the earlier works, the Odes and the Seasons, show genuine love of nature; the later ones, the dramas, contain but few scattered and rather unimportant references to nature; while their letters of this later period still bear witness to a love of nature as real if not as active, as that of their youth." There is, however, little surprising in this and the observation would hold equally true of any other writers whose dramas and lyrics we might choose to compare. The reason lies in the nature of the case and is due to the fact that the rapid dialogue of a drama gives but little opportunity for description of nature. We can not, therefore, conclude from an absence of such descriptions as to the poet's attitude towards nature. In the case of Klopstock, the love of nature evinced by his letters is fully borne out by his dramas in which he eagerly seizes every opportunity, where lyric passages occur (for example, in the *Hermanns Schlacht*) to introduce such references.

In the title of one of Stolberg's poems mentioned on page 59 a misprint occurs. It should read: *An die Weende bei (not von) Göttingen*, the *Weende* being a little brook which runs through the village of the same name, where according to one theory the poets of the Hainbund held their moonlight revelries.

In the third chapter Batt treats of the love of nature as evinced by the letters of the eighteenth century. It is from the letters of a man that one obtains best an insight into his character and real feelings, as he is then off his guard and is not writing for publication. Such documents, therefore, form invaluable pieces of evidence, by which to judge of the sincerity of the love of nature ex-

pressed in his poems. On this very account it would have been better I think to have incorporated the results of the study of the letters of a given author into the section treating of his poetic works, especially as few are mentioned in the chapter on letters, who were not treated of before, so that it is to some extent a repetition of the foregoing.

This does not however apply to the fourth chapter, on the treatment of nature in contemporary books of travel, for very few names are here duplicated. This chapter is in my opinion the most valuable part of the dissertation, as it deals with a part of the subject never treated before. The results are however rather negative, the works on travel containing on the whole but few descriptions of natural scenery. This is undoubtedly due to the fact, which Biese has pointed out, that the fatigues and dangers of travel over the wretched roads often infested with highwaymen were such as to prevent the average traveller from seeing anything beautiful in the districts through which he passed.

The second monograph on the treatment of nature in Nikolaus Lenau, by Professor von Klenze is a very welcome addition to our knowledge of this interesting poet. The author has done, what Batt should have done, given us a detailed study of one man and by collecting instances has analyzed Lenau's treatment of nature, showing what features of it he most appreciated and what he was fondest of choosing in forming his images. The selection of Lenau was a happy one, as few poets have possessed such a genuine love of nature or felt the necessity of constant communion with her as did he. Lenau's rather eccentric and morbid nature would lead us to expect a predilection for the melancholy aspects of nature and this is fully borne out by von Klenze's investigation. Descriptions of bright, sunny landscapes, of the joys of early morning occur but seldom. He is fondest of describing the approach of evening and the subtle charm of moonlight. The dreary and monotonous stretches of heath with which he was so familiar, appeal to him strongly, and although he seems to appreciate the beauties of the spring, as many poems show, he likes best to depict the coming of autumn, the leaves falling one by one and the wind rustling through the withered foliage.

As von Klenze has pointed out, Lenau was a great admirer of the grandeur and majesty of mountain scenery. He became so enamored of the Alps that he determined to visit them at least once a year. Also in the case of the sea it was its vastness and sublimity in a storm which fascinated him. Too much stress however is, in my opinion, laid upon these aspects of nature. On page 29, Richard Meyer is severely scored for his bad *blunder* in saying that Lenau was no admirer of an imposing landscape. Undoubtedly Meyer has committed a blunder here, as von Klenze's examples clearly show, and yet he is not so entirely wrong. The impression that one carries away from the perusal of Lenau's poems is that he is fondest of describing some quiet, idyllic spot in the woods where the nightingales sing or where a murmuring brook flows between meadows, shaded by overhanging willow trees. In spite of his enthusiasm for the Alps he seems most at home in the gentler scenes of nature.

Von Klenze denies to Lenau an appreciation of valleys and yet he is forced to acknowledge the genuineness of the outburst, when the poet exclaims:

Du heimatliches Tal,  
Mir wird so wohl und wehe,  
Dass ich dich nun einmal,  
Ersehntes! wiedersehe.

It is true that the word for valley does not occur as frequently as that of mountain, but that is because mountains are a much more striking feature of the landscape than valleys. When standing in the valley the imposing character of the mountains impresses us forcibly and we naturally mention them by name, but when describing the aspects of nature in a valley, it is the individual features of the landscape, which are spoken of by name and not the valley itself. Many passages might be cited which testify to Lenau's love for valleys. In *Glauben, Wissen, Handeln* the poet turns from the purple glow of the mountains and exclaims:

Sei willkommen  
O Dunkelheit, im ersten Eichental!

Again, when in his exquisite poem, *Einst und Jetzt*, he longs for the spot where he was so happy as a boy, it is a valley that he so yearns to see:

Möchte wieder in die Gegend,  
 Wo ich einst so selig war,  
 Wo ich lebte, wo ich träumte  
 Meiner Jugend schönsten Jahr!  
 . . . . .  
 Endlich ward mir nun beschieden  
 Wiederkehr in's traute Tal.

In *Frühling, Neid der Sehnsucht, Lenz* and a great number of other poems the landscape described is clearly that of a valley, although the fact is not always specifically mentioned.

The claim is also made that Lenau had no appreciation of trees. This is perhaps true of the tree as an individual. The word *Baum* occurs seldom and but few species of trees are mentioned.<sup>3</sup> Many people however are more susceptible to the beauty of trees when united to a grove or a forest than when standing alone. Such is the case with Lenau. It would be strange indeed if the poet who as a boy passed whole days in the forests of his native land hunting for birds, should not have acquired a deep love for the manifold charms of the woods. This side of Lenau's nature von Klenze has scarcely touched upon and yet no words descriptive of nature occur more frequently than *Wald* and *Hain*, much more frequently, for example, than *Berg* or *Meer*. So numerous are the instances that it is difficult to tell which to select. In *Herbstgefühl* he exclaims:

Wo sind Wälder eure Wonnen?

In the *Indianerzug* he describes how the Indians fire their guns:

Zum Scheidegruss den trauten Waldesräumen.

In spite of his love for the sea, which von Klenze especially emphasizes, we see him consumed with longing for the woods when on the dreary waste of waters. Eagerly he inquires of the wind:

Wie geht es meinen Wäldern  
 Am frischen Neckarfluss?

Again when at sea he thinks of his fatherland so far away and listening intently, he exclaims joyfully:

Da wird so heimisch mir zu Mut,  
 Als hörte ich was von dir.

Mir ist, ich hör' im Winde gehn  
 Dein heilig Eichenlaub  
 Wo die Gedanken still verwehn  
 Den süßen Stundenraub.

<sup>3</sup>To those given by v. Klenze, *Buchen* and *Linden* might be added.

In *Wiedersehen* he claims to know every tree of his native valley and in another poem written in the *Stammbuch einer Künstlerin* the wood rustles its greeting and he turns from the lofty paths of life to the secret and the solitude of the forest. Most of all, however, his beautiful *Waldlieder* give evidence of his love of the woods and of the healing influence they exerted on his overwrought mind.

Apart from these minor points of difference, I fully agree with the conclusions at which von Klenze has arrived. The arrangement of the monograph is exceedingly good and the introductory chapter gives evidence of extensive and accurate knowledge of the poets of nature. Exception might be taken to the use of the word *vivification* as a translation of *Beseelung*, in which the author has followed Professor Morton of the Indiana University. The word *personification* has always been used in English to express the ascribing of life to inanimate objects, and in fact it is used by Biese twice as synonymous with *Beseelung*.

It is to be hoped that other studies of a similar nature will be added to this really excellent monograph on Lenau.

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY.

University of Pennsylvania.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In Fable LX of Warnke's edition of the fables of Marie de France<sup>1</sup> lines 17 and 18 are given as follows:

current après tuit li pastur;  
 li chien li huënt tut en tur.

That is, *huënt* is made intransitive, the predicate of *chien*.

There are twenty manuscripts containing this fable, and nineteen use the word *chiens*, the twentieth having a different reading. Of these nineteen, not one gives the reading *chien*, in the nominative case; the oblique case, *chiens*, occurs in every one. As to the article, sixteen manuscripts have the oblique *les* (*lez*), one has *li*, one *lor*, and

<sup>1</sup>*Die Fabeln der Marie de France*, hrsg. von Karl Warnke. Halle, 1898. See p. 199.



one *des*. It seems to me, then, that these lines should read as follows:

curent apres tuit li pastur,  
les chiens li huënt tut en tur.

That is, I would make *chiens* the direct object of *huënt*, and *huënt* the predicate of *pastur*.

This reading is supported by line 48 of Fable XCIII,<sup>2</sup> which in Warnke's edition reads

de tutes parz les chiens huèrent,

the subject of the verb referring to *li pastur* in line 44.

Further, we have two examples from the *Roman de Renart*:

Et li a hué deus mastins (Méon, 4631).<sup>3</sup>  
S'il me huoit ses trois gainnons (Martin, ix, 1921).<sup>4</sup>

Referring to the Latin versions of this fable, we find that of four versions given by Hervieux, (Phèdre, 2)<sup>5</sup> only one (Fable I, *Fabulae ex Mariae Gallicae Romulo et aliis quoque Fontibus exortae*) mentions dogs. The reading of this is as follows:

Aderant forte pastores in campo, qui Vulpem profugam canibus et clamoribus insequabantur.

This reading, as well as the fact that the dogs are not mentioned in the other versions, would tend to support my interpretation; that is, that the subject of the action is the shepherds, not the dogs.

WALTER T. PEIRCE.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### NOTE ON *Bartholomew Fair*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Busy, in his farcical controversy with the puppets in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, 1614, charges the players with being an abomination; for the male, among you, putteth on the apparel of the female, and the female of the male [Act v, Sc. III; Gifford's text]. The first charge, that the male putteth on the apparel of the female, referred of course to the common practice of the day, and, as the puppet replied, was the Puritans' old stale argument against the players; but even that bold conjecturer, Fleay, has queried, When did the female put on the apparel of the male? That this

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, p. 302.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Roman de Renart*, publ. par M. D. M. Méon, Paris, 1826. See p. 173.

<sup>4</sup> *Le Roman de Renart*, publ. par Ernest Martin, Paris, 1882. See p. 333.

<sup>5</sup> *Les Fabulistes Latins*, par Léopold Hervieux, Paris, 1884. Vol. II, p. 533.

could not have been usual, is certain from the fact that in all the Puritan attacks, nowhere is it mentioned. Finally, all perplexity is removed, it seems to me, by reference to *Deuteronomy*, xxii, 5: "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God."

It was a part of Jonson's satire on the Puritans, and well in keeping with Busy's inspired ignorance, that most of the time he was not well informed of what he was zealously attacking; and having in mind a Biblical admonition, he had not sufficient wit to use only that part which might apply.

CARROLL S. ALDEN.

Yale University.

#### GERMAN BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Doubtless many readers of *Modern Language Notes* will be interested in a new German organization that promises to do very valuable work in a field never yet cultivated systematically. I refer to the *Deutsche Bibliographische Gesellschaft*, formed last year, whose general purpose is sufficiently indicated by its title. The first task to be accomplished by this Society will be the exact location and indication of the vast amount of material, now so difficult of access, stowed away in journals, correspondence, collections of essays, etc., before the period covered by the *Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte*. The first volume of the Publications, on the journals of the Romantic period, is now in press. There can hardly be any doubt of the success of an enterprise whose executive committee includes such names as those of Professors Sauer (Vice-President), Elster, Koch, Köster, Litzmann, R. M. Meyer, Minor, Muncker, Stern, von Waldberg, Walzel, R. M. Werner, and Dr. Houben. The annual membership fee is six marks, and gives the privilege of purchasing the publications of the Society at a considerably reduced price. The address of the Secretary is: Dr. H. H. HOUBEN, Ebersstr. 91, Berlin-Schöneberg; those who desire membership should remit the fee of six marks to S. HERZ, Dorotheenstr. 1, Berlin NW., with the note: "Für die Bibliographische Gesellschaft."

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.